

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It has long been the fashion to censure the Jews for their particularism, but in truth there is a good deal of the particularist in all of us, or at any rate in most of us. In religion we associate most readily with those with whom we agree, and we are apt to ignore a challenge, which might be for our soul's profit, from those from whom we differ. But we have everything to gain from cultivating generous sympathies, and he must be a richly endowed man indeed who has nothing to learn from other people.

More particularly have Jews and Christians persistently misunderstood one another. They have done this from the beginning, and it is much to be hoped that they will not continue to do it to the end. Much of this misunderstanding is undoubtedly due to ignorance. Not many Jews take the trouble to acquaint themselves with the New Testament; many Christians know little of the Old Testament, while most know nothing whatever of Rabbinical Literature. Indeed, this is a field which even to many Christian scholars has been till recently, and to some extent still is, practically a *terra incognita*.

If there is one man more fitted than another to mediate between these two groups and to create, if not a reconciliation, at least an understanding, that man is Mr. Claude G. MONTEFIORE. His is a

singularly rich and impartial mind. A devoted son of Judaism, he has made a study, not only minute but sympathetic, of the New Testament documents, and whether in dealing with the one literature or with the other, he always manifestly endeavours to be scrupulously fair: he has no desire to think more highly of the one, or less highly of the other, than an honest examination of the facts obliges him to think.

In his recently published book *The Old Testament and After* (reviewed in 'Literature') his powers of skilful presentation and sane and helpful criticism are seen at their best. True, he professes to be an amateur in Rabbinical literature, and inadequately equipped for the discussion of the literature in which Greek and Hebrew thought converge; but when we consider that there has been a continuous stream of Jewish literature for nearly three thousand years, who is sufficient for these things? To say the least, Mr. Montefiore is as competent as any, and we watch with more than interest his endeavour, as he puts it, to 'absorb the good and reject the evil, whether in the Old Testament, the New Testament, or the Rabbinical literature.' In a spirit the reverse of supercilious, he stands above them all.

No one could be more refreshingly frank in his criticism of the Rabbis. 'Much of their teaching

seems childish and absurd.' 'Much of the Rabbinic study of the Law was casuistic; much of it narrowing; much of it trifling; much of it an appalling waste of time and brain.' 'Legalism lays its rather coarsening and vulgarizing hands upon every conception in heaven and earth.' An impression is given in the Talmud as if those old Rabbis were men 'with a restricted outlook, and enmeshed in a study the great mass of which was of very doubtful advantage to the world.' That on the one hand; and of all that, Christian criticism has been well aware.

But there is another side which that criticism has not been so ready to recognize. 'On the whole,' the attitude of Rabbinic literature has been 'sane and simple and broad'; it is 'a mixture of delicacy and everyday practicality.' 'God is always in the thoughts of the Rabbis.' 'The study of the Law helps a man to meekness, fidelity, and charitableness; it keeps him far from sin, and brings him near to virtue; he ought to become a lover of God and of mankind, modest, long-suffering, and forgiving of insults. The study of the Law demands a measure of endurance and asceticism; and, for the rest, reverence and cheerfulness, contentment and resignation; the student must be long-suffering and claim no merit; he must love God and man; he must not boast, he must judge his fellows favourably; he must accept reproofs willingly; he must bear the yoke with his fellows. The virtues are gentle human virtues, tending to unite and not to separate. Moreover, these gentle human virtues did not, when occasion demanded, exclude the heroic virtues as well.' Again, God is no 'cold, distant, transcendent, unapproachable Deity'; this is a 'monstrous misunderstanding of the Rabbis which can only be retained by the ignorant or the prejudiced.' And all these claims are illustrated by a wealth of quotation which those who despise Rabbinical literature without knowing it would do well to ponder.

Nor is Mr. MONTEFIORE blind to the imperfections, to what he calls the gaps and rough edges,

of the Old Testament. In this connexion perhaps his most striking criticism is in his allusion to its 'comparative lack of high idealism,' 'a certain lack of *élan* and passion, of eager and redeeming philanthropy.' But Liberal Judaism, though it claims the right to be critical, is deeply rooted in the Old Testament, and there is more than one fine summary of its peculiar excellence—its conceptions of 'God's unity and righteousness, of the inseparable union of religion and morality, of social justice, pity, and love, of the love of neighbour and stranger, of the election of Israel for a religious mission and service, of the joy of communion with God.'

Of peculiar interest to Christians is Mr. MONTEFIORE'S criticism of the New Testament, and more particularly of Jesus. Often he speaks of its 'moving and wonderful words'—such words as we find in the First Epistle of John or in 1 Co 13. The Old Testament deficiency in 'eager and redeeming philanthropy' already alluded to, he finds 'most grandly filled up by the teaching of Jesus and Paul'; and he emphasizes the point that the mysticism of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John goes beyond anything we have in the Psalter. 'We have here a veritable New Testament supplement to Old Testament teaching.'

Perhaps the two most startling statements in the book occur in his estimate of Jesus. One is this: 'The universalism which we acknowledge, and for which we are grateful, in Paul, is not clearly to be found in the teachings of Jesus'—apparently not even in the story of the good Samaritan. Mr. MONTEFIORE is 'very confident that "Samaritan" formed no part of the original parable as spoken by Jesus.' The second surprise is: 'The beginning in the teaching of Jesus of a double morality.' 'It is implied that, in the fullest sense, not all men could be "disciples." Not every man could be expected to renounce all that he had, or to "hate" father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, "yea and his own life." There must be an inner and an outer ring.'

Here we must take leave to part company with the distinguished writer. The illustration which he adduces, of the young man who had great possessions, hardly proves his point. Has Mr. MONTEFIORE forgotten the 'occasional' nature of Jesus' utterances? 'If *thou* wilt be perfect, sell thy goods.' This particular demand tested the quality of that particular man's devotion to Jesus and the cause which He represented: in his case it was his possessions, as the sequel showed, that stood between him and the Kingdom: hence the demand for their renunciation. But the demand of Jesus upon every man was always for whole-hearted uncompromising allegiance, though the form it assumed would vary with the character of the man on whom the demand was made. But whether you agree with Mr. MONTEFIORE or not, you feel throughout his book that you are in communion with a gracious, friendly, and healing spirit.

One of the subjects of supreme interest to the present generation is what may be called, in a broad sense, Spiritual Healing. Christian Science, New Thought, Psycho-analysis (on its practical side) are aspects of the modern healing cult. But there is another movement that has much the same object but operates from a different standpoint and with a different equipment. Of this movement one of the most enthusiastic protagonists is the Rev. Claude O'FLAHERTY, M.B., Ch.B., Senior Chaplain at St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh.

Mr. O'FLAHERTY's degree is to be noted, for he is both a medical man and a priest. And it may be said at once that his attitude to the medical profession is entirely respectful and sympathetic. But he has a great message to deliver and a great mission to commend to the Church, and he does both these things in a book recently published, *Health and Religion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). There is a great deal in the book that is interesting and valuable from a general religious standpoint. There are admirable chapters on 'Man's Relation

to God,' 'The Healing Ministry of Jesus Christ,' and 'Grace and the Sacramental Principle.'

But we reach the message of the book when we come to the chapter on 'Sacramental Healing.' The author warns us, first of all, that the health of the body is to be sought not for selfish reasons but for more efficient service to God; and, secondly, that our nature is a unity. Body, mind, and spirit are so bound up with one another that a disorder in one affects the other; and Jesus came to be the Healer and Redeemer of the whole man. His healing ministry was part of a ministry of redemption and restoration for mankind.

This ministry was to be continued by His Church. 'The command to heal was as definitely and clearly given as the command to preach the Gospel and forgive sins.' And in His Spirit the Apostles continued to do the works of Christ. There is no ground for supposing that the healing of the sick by spiritual means was a temporary gift to the Church. On the contrary, there is definite and abundant evidence that for several centuries such healing was an everyday practice in the Church. And it is significant that the apologists of the early centuries cited as evidence of the truth of Christian doctrine, not the miracles of our Lord, but the contemporary works of healing which the ministers of Christ were performing in every place. It was only later, when the standard of faith and conduct became lower, that works of healing became fewer.

Out of many forms of healing in use in the early Church two persisted and are in use to-day, namely, the Laying-on of Hands and the Anointing with blessed oil. The first was enjoined by our Lord Himself, and the second is in accord with apostolic doctrine and practice. The ministers of healing were two, priests and laymen endowed with the gift of the Holy Spirit.

It is, of course, true of sacramental healing, as of every other sacramental rite, that the grace of the sacrament is received by faith. If faith flags,

healing is delayed. If faith recovers, works of healing abound. Our Lord wrought cures on the sick by spiritual means which are open to us, but it was always on condition of a believing attitude.

There is a human basis for this ministry in the close connexion of body and mind. In point of fact there are three kinds of healers—the physical, the mental, and the spiritual. Mr. O'FLAHERTY recognizes the place and the use both of the doctor and the psycho-therapist, but the spiritual healer does what neither of the others can do, because he deals with the deepest roots of health and disease. 'Spiritual healing, when it brings peace and order and health to the spirit, also resolves complexes in the mind, removes fear and anxiety, and gives mental peace. And mental and spiritual peace produce the conditions under which the natural vitality of the body can reassert itself and throw off disease.'

The reconciliation of the doctrine of Salvation by faith alone with an adequate view of the necessity in the Christian life of good works is not easy. Many preachers have an uncomfortable feeling that they have to bring back surreptitiously with the one hand what they have ostentatiously thrown away with the other, and do it so skilfully that 'the plain man' in the pew will not notice. 'Saved by faith alone, but not by a faith that abides alone'—by some such mediating formula, the antinomy is plausibly if not quite successfully overcome.

As if this difficulty were not enough, the 'new thought' threatens to drag into clear light another antinomy. 'Salvation by right thinking' is proclaimed with enthusiasm. Not that it has never been heard of before. Far from that. Ancient Greece was familiar with it. But it is proclaimed in a new way and with fresh sanctions.

The difficulty, however, has been lying there all the time in Scripture itself. When we consult it

on the topic of right thinking, we find a perplexity not unlike that which confronts us on the subject of good works.

On the one hand we have such passages as these: 'As he thinketh in his heart, so is he' (Pr 23⁷). 'We were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight' (Nu 13³³). On the other hand we have such as these: 'Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall' (1 Co 10¹²). 'Be not wise in your own conceits' (Ro 12¹⁶), and a multitude of others which inculcate humility in one's thoughts of oneself.

Both sides need careful consideration, for both are true. Experience proves it. If the Israelite rates himself as a poor grasshopper, the Canaanite will soon come to agree with him. Thoughts, even imaginations, tend to realize themselves. Men always knew that more or less clearly. St. Paul knew it well when he laid down his famous rule for right thinking (Ph 4⁸). But modern psychology has given fresh and impressive force to the fact that as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he. What he aspires after, he tends to become. What he ardently desires, he in some measure, sooner or later, receives. The content and the 'tone' of thought react powerfully on physical health, shape character, and help to secure, or to lose, for a man such desirable things as popularity and business success.

Despite the harm done to such truths by quacks and charlatans they remain truths of experience, and they make such a hymn as 'O to be nothing, nothing' sound very silly, or, if anybody ever were to take it in earnest, suicidal.

But then there is the other side, upon which Scripture and experience are just as strong. The wisdom of all the ages condemns conceit, pride, and self-righteousness as the surest way to ruin. 'Humility,' as Principal Iverach pointed out, is 'the other side of greatness,' in such wise that without humility there can be no true greatness.

Here we are, then, shut up between two seemingly contradictory statements which are both demonstrably true. If we do not think highly of ourselves, we shall never be anything; if we do esteem ourselves highly, we are on very slippery ground and have probably put great attainments beyond our reach. How to do justice to both is a pretty problem. We have never heard such a mediating formula as helped us in the case of faith and works. He who can construct one will do a great service.

These remarks have been suggested by a book which seems to us quite worth consideration on one side of the antinomy, *Life's Practical Philosophy*, by Charles WASE (Rider; 4s. 6d. net). On the whole subject of right thinking it is not good, for it ignores the other side of the antinomy. As a practical philosophy of life it is sadly deficient. It has no place for salvation from sin in any real sense of either of the terms, and no place for Christ except as 'the Great Master.' Its salvation is essentially salvation of the individual by himself through his own inner resources, guided only by great examples. We have no manner of faith in that.

But if one is sound on the essentials of the Christian salvation and regeneration, and can in consequence pass on without misunderstanding to the working out of his own salvation as the Apostle enjoins, he will be helped by what our author has to say on the prime necessity of right thinking and on what manner of things should occupy one's thoughts. Many good quotations might be given. Let these suffice:

'Remind yourself continually of the presence within you and within others of the Ideal Self, which is a successful, happy, and healthy self. You are continually painting mental pictures. See that you paint the pictures of a happy, healthy, and harmonious life and its right attainment. Right desire will make these pictures real and living, when you follow it with right action.'

'Thoughts of health, confidence, strength, and intelligence will help to develop these essential qualities in you. You will never be able to do things if you think you cannot. With your thoughts concentrated upon reality—think and affirm—"I am such and such in the ideal, real world" and be it in actual expression. With this mental attitude you can trust . . . that all the forces of the Universe are working with you.'

There is a striking article in the June number of the *Church Missionary Review* by Constance L. MAYNARD, with the challenging title 'Are Missions to the East Needed?' In view of the difficulties, is missionary effort worth while? It is true our race is gifted with a love of adventure and a great power of endurance. We have also an exceptional power of dealing with the less civilized races; and our word is everywhere trusted and respected.

But consider the contra account. There are the by no means negligible physical troubles—malaria, fevers, dysentery, dangers. There are the indifference, hostility, cruelty of human beings. There is the constant strain of labour and disappointment and deprivation. There are isolation and exile, weariness, want of sympathy. And, amid all, the continual demand for courage, patience, and cheerfulness. Put what you like on the other side, yet let us not be under delusions as to what we have to face.

There is a great deal more. And the question puts itself in view of it all: Have we something to give to non-Christian nations that is of such supreme value that we are willing to pay a price which is heavy, however you look at it? There can be no doubt about the answer when we consider only uncivilized peoples. The terrors of magic and witch-doctors, the cruelty to infancy and old age, the degradation of women, the fear of evil spirits—all this has been swept away and the souls of men have been led into light and liberty.

But it is another matter when you look at the great organized religions. Why should not one form of religious faith appeal to one type and another form to another? The mental equipments of East and West are very different. So long as the religion of non-Christians has some control of a reasonable kind over conduct, so long as it satisfies *them* and gives them hope and inspiration, why should we disturb them? That is a question that is asked by many cool observers, travellers, and even residents in non-Christian lands.

Look at the four great religions. There is Muhammadanism. It starts from the opposite end of truth from Christianity, from the metaphysical. It emphasizes the transcendence of God and a sovereignty that is hard and unbending. Predestination is absolute; the future is as unalterable as the past. All that Christianity stands for is wanting in the God of Muhammadanism. Buddhism, on the other hand, emphasizes the immanence of God. It is nearly identical with pantheism. God is impersonal, and man is but a dewdrop that slips into the shining sea of the eternal life. His future is the stripping off of the shadow of personality which he possesses on earth.

The third of the great religions is Hinduism. It is a religion of rites and rules. At its heart is the passionate desire for an incarnation of the unseen God who is behind everything. This desire is satisfied by its 330 million gods, who are personifications of nature-processes. Morality does not count in this pantheon, and the Hindu faith leads to an utter confusion between good and evil. Its 'holy men' may be good; they may also equally be brutish, malign, and wicked. The fourth religion, Confucianism, is 'the religion of a gentleman.' It is good form. In point of fact it is more an ethic—a kindly, brave ethic—than a faith. It is so sound that Dr. John Mott has said, 'If you want to sow the good seed on paving-stones, go to South America; and if you want to sow it on ploughed land, go to China.'

What, then, have we to give to these peoples? The Muhammadan needs everything that is connected with the Incarnation. The Buddhist needs the conviction of personality, in both God and man. For him we have 'the gift of eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.' The undying thirst in Hinduism for a God who is near and real points straight to the central message of the Gospel, and India is crying out for this. In China the soil is open and prepared, and what China needs is a spiritual message, the evangel of the grace of God.

Christ is the desire of *all* nations. The four great religions we may surely regard as parts of the preliminary revelation of God, calling men to Himself. They are broken lights of Him, and in His truth and grace He is more than they. Each of them is 'a prayer for life,' and in Him is the life.

What doth the Lord require of thee? To a religious person no question can be more important than that. And already in the Old Testament comes the immortal answer: 'To do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.' The answer is simplicity itself. Duty is defined in terms of social service inspired by religion. Justice, love, and a humble walk with God—that is all.

But is that really all? Yes, Micah seems to say, that is all. For his words are not merely a statement, they are a protest—a protest against the rivers of oil and the rams and the calves and the burnt-offerings, which seemed to his contemporaries so indispensable an element in the service of God. Emphatically these things formed no part of the divine demand. So at least thought Micah.

And he is not alone in thinking this. Prophets both before and after him thought the same. Indeed, two of them went further and maintained that animal sacrifice had never formed any part of that demand—not at any rate in the only period which for this purpose mattered, that is, in the good old days of Moses, when Jahweh had so signally

revealed His gracious will towards Israel. 'Was it sacrifices,' Amos asks, 'and offerings that ye brought unto me in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?' And the answer is most evidently, No. Then and now and evermore the divine demand is that justice roll like water, and righteousness like a perennial stream. A century and a half afterwards we find Jeremiah giving expression to the same view of history and of God. 'I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices.'

The evidence of the prophets on this supreme question is not extensive, but it at least seems to be explicit. Isaiah represents Jahweh as saying, 'I delight not in the blood of bullocks,' and Trito-Isaiah, pouring scorn on the ritual fasting of his day, asserts that the fast which is truly acceptable to Jahweh is the fast from social injustice, which will come to expression in clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, freeing the oppressed. To men like these it would seem as if the whole priestly way of life were simply an irrelevance. Their attitude is summed up most succinctly by Hosea when he says, in words which seem to have been specially dear to our Lord, 'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.'

More wonderful still, this attitude is shared by some of the psalmists. 'Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in, burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required.' 'Thou delightest not in sacrifice, thou hast no pleasure in burnt-offerings.' The psalmists, like the prophets, are not merely negative. If they can tell us what God has no delight in, they also know what He does delight in and demand. In the prophets, not sacrifice, but mercy; in the psalmists, not sacrifice, but 'a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart.'

'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.' It seems impossible to evade the simple force of these and the similar words already quoted. Yet many modern scholars hesitate to take them at their full

face-value. It is urged, on the one hand, that the prophets, like many a public speaker, made occasional use of the language of hyperbole, in order to direct attention to an aspect of truth which their hearers were ignoring. It is urged on the other hand that, as children of their time, they could not have broken so completely with the traditions of their people, and could not have hurled so radical a criticism at institutions and practices universally accepted by the contemporary world. Professor J. M. P. SMITH of Chicago, in his recently published *The Moral Life of the Hebrews* (reviewed in 'Literature'), maintains, for example, that 'a religion without ritual would have been practically inconceivable to the Hebrew mind, and the prophets never ceased to be Hebrews.' The question is clearly then, in part, how much originality may be ascribed to the prophets.

The evidence, as we have said, however meagre, seems explicit, but apparently it is not unambiguous, judging by the various interpretations put upon it by modern scholars. Let us hear some of them. Professor Smith, whom we have just quoted, says: 'It will hardly do to make Amos wholly discard ritual and put ethics in its place. . . . He was not consistently hostile to ritual. . . . It is safer to assume that he is protesting not against ritual *per se*, but against making ritual do service for character and right conduct.' Let us hear Professor T. H. ROBINSON. While admitting in his *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel*, that 'Hosea and Jeremiah had no use for sacrifice,' he goes on, 'Pre-exilic Prophets would not, perhaps, have swept it away altogether; their concern was to see that men realized that religion was a moral and spiritual thing, and not merely a ritual one.' And again, 'The attitude of the earlier prophets might have been different had the ritual been of that purer type which the Law maintained,' though Dr. ROBINSON frankly adds that 'they would never for an instant have endorsed the contention that ritual of any kind was among the absolute demands of Yahweh.' Similarly the late Professor R. A. AYTON in his *God in the Old Testament*: 'At first

sight,' he says, the prophets 'appear to advocate a purely ethical and spiritual religion from which all outward forms in worship are banished as utterly irrelevant and valueless.' But 'it did not necessarily follow that if the heart and life were right even then there was no place for the outward and visible in worship; but what value these might have they did not suggest.'

Now let us hear the other side. In *Altar, Cross, and Community*, Professor W. F. LOTHOUSE in a striking paragraph argues: 'The prophets do not say, "No rite is of use while the heart is wrong." They never imply that it will be of any use when the heart is right. What they would have said if they had been discussing pure and untainted sacrifices we do not know. But the fact that in discussing debased sacrifices they spoke of sacrifices as a whole suggests the answer.' Emeritus Principal SKINNER takes the same line. 'It is commonly held,' he remarks in *Prophecy and Religion*, 'that the prophets' repudiation of sacrifice was not absolute, but relative to the prevalent delusion that cultus apart from morality has an inherent value in the sight of God. That is to say, they did not reject sacrifice as such, but only as offered by a people that had lost the true knowledge of God. It seems clear, however, that the prophetic principle goes further than that. Not only is sacrifice of no avail as a substitute for righteous conduct, but a perfect religious relationship is possible without sacrifice at all. . . . They never demand a purified ritual, but always and ex-

clusively the fulfilment of the ethical commands of Yahwe.' Finally, let us hear Mr. C. G. MONTEFIORE. In *The Old Testament and After*, he defines 'the great prophetic achievement,' which he describes as 'of deathless importance,' thus: 'That the worship and the offerings which God asks and likes, demands and cares for, are not sheep and goats and incense and oil, but justice, confession, contrition, and the pure heart.'

Where doctors differ, what is the plain man to do? Two things he may do. He may say that the prophetic conception of religion is not exhaustive: the priest must be heard too. Or he may say that the prophets are the supreme interpreters of religion and that they mean what they say, without mitigation or modification. If it be argued that so bold a challenge of the universal ritual customs in which they had been brought up is simply inconceivable, it may be answered that with men of their insight and calibre, it is precisely the inconceivable that is possible. Isaiah and his brethren in prophecy were very bold. And it may well have been that their conception of animal sacrifice as an irrelevance and a futility—if that was indeed their conception—rested upon profound conceptions of the ultimate nature of God which they would have been prepared to defend by argument, had argument been their province. For did not even a psalmist represent the God he worshipped as saying:

Will I eat the flesh of bulls,
Or drink the blood of goats?

The Structure of St. Paul's Hymn of Love.

BY THE REVEREND F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D., THE RECTORY, KINNITTY,
KING'S COUNTY, IRELAND.

THE following is an attempt to show that this famous hymn was originally written in metre. It would seem that the apostle had before his mind in the pleasant hours of composition such lyrical passages as the choral odes in the later plays of

Euripides. He appears to have noticed the skill with which that dramatist and others blended and varied their metres. The ode seems to fall naturally into four divisions, with points of transition between each—each of the four having again three parts

resembling in some way the strophe, antistrophe, and epode of the Greek ode and chorus, on a much smaller scale and with some general, though not the same precise, correspondence. For example, the first strophe would be :

ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις (Dochmiac)
τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Dispondeus)
λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων (Troch. with iambic base)
ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω (Troch. with anacrusis)
γέγονα χαλκός. ἤχῳ (Troch. syzygy)
ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζων (Iam. dim. cat.).

And the last epode would run :

νῦν δὲ μένει (spondee, anapæst)
πίστις ἐλπίς ἀγάπη (cretic, 4th Pæon) cf.
Electra (S.), 1384 (Jebb)
τὰ τρία ταῦτα (Dactyl, spondee)
μείζων δὲ τούτων (dochmiac)
ἢ ἀγάπη (choriamb.)
Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην (dactylic, with base) cf.
Ketides, Aisch. 526 (Paley).

There are parallels to each of these lines in the Greek dramatists. The whole poem can be written out, as I have found in this way, Dochmiacs being numerous.

It is remarkable how well the matter and form correspond all through. This shows something of the author's care. We may also see the influence of Pindar in the fourfold division of the poem. In ten of his odes Pindar has four systems of triads, based, it would seem, on the divisions of the Greek Temple, which often had three, and in some cases four compartments. *Ol.* vi. 1-3 might be rendered 'placing golden pillars under the well-built vestibule we shall build as it were a stately temple (*megaron*) of song.' *Megaron* is rendered 'palace,' but in Herodotus it is used of a shrine, and Pindar speaks of his daughters worshipping in his own chapel (*prothuron*, *Pyth.* iii. 78). In the temples of Athena at Athens, and of Diana at Ephesus, we have the four divisions: *prothuron* or porch, *pronaos* or vestibule, the *naos* or shrine, and the *opisthodomos*, which was the treasury. This fourfold division of the classic temple may well be reproduced in certain of Pindar's odes and in this Psalm of Love. In Pindar the divisions are connected by some word, just as in this hymn we have links between the divisions—like doors of connexion. We shall see that the four divisions of the hymn correspond in character, position, and importance to those of the

great Greek temple. The first section comprises vv.¹⁻³; the second, vv.^{4-8a}; the third, vv.^{8b-11}; the fourth, v.¹²⁻¹⁴^{1a}, the link between 1 and 2 being 'that I may boast' (v.³) the second section enlarging on the absence of boastfulness in Love; the link between 2 and 3 being 'never faileth' (v.⁸), the third section describing the passing of various gifts; the link between 3 and 4 being 'child' (v.¹¹), which suggests the contrast between the puerile present and our future manhood to be developed in a sphere of glorious vision and ripest knowledge.

The opening words of this ode conjure up in our imagination a scene of life, bustle, and worship before one of those classic temples, like that of Diana or the Parthenon. We see the worshippers, Juvenal's 'raucous crowd,' walking in procession through the street, dancers and musicians among them. With clanging of cymbals and beating of tambourines they advance, rejoicing in their pagan ceremonial, whereas 'Love rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth' (v. 6). Such a procession is described by the Roman poet Catullus, who died 54 B.C. (lxiii. 21, 28 f.). 'When the voice sings to the cymbal, when the tambourines (*tympana*) resound, the procession suddenly bursts forth into shouts (*ululat*) with quivering tongues' (*linguis*).¹ In this passage we have, as in St. Paul's hymn, the cymbal and the tambourine (*χαλκός ἤχῳ*, resonant bronze, *i.e.* the *tympanum*), the metal globes of the former and the little bells of the latter making a clashing noise. We have also the *shouts* of the people in both, *ululat* and *ἀλαλάζων* (L. marg.), literally, to shout *alalai* or victory. The masculine participle means shouting loudly to the accompaniment of the cymbal; the neuter refers to the triumphant clanging of the cymbal, but it is the band that shouts in Catullus, and here the same idea seems preferable, as the Greek verb is seldom used of musical instruments. We have also the *tongues* of men in both. Similar parallels are found in Propertius (iv. 7), who refers to the round bronzes (*aera*) of Cybele; in Ovid (*F.* iv. 213), who says, 'they beat *cymbals* for spears and tambourines (*tympana*) instead of shields,' when describing the *Deæ comites* at their services. Juvenal (vi. 515) speaks of the '*rauca cohors* with their plebeian

¹ 'Ubi cymbalum sonat vox, ubi tympana reboant, Thiasus repente linguis trepidantibus ululat.'

'Where the voice shouts to the accompaniment of cymbal.'

tambourines.' Horace (*Sat.* ii. 3. 223) compares the noise of the worshippers to that of thunder 'circumtonuit Bellona'; and Euripides speaks of the 'voice of the bronze' (χαλκοῦ αὐδᾶ, *Hel.* 1346). These parallels make it probable that St. Paul was thinking of just such a procession moving forwards with upraised voices and bands playing to the temple of a pagan divinity, making the day or night hideous with noise. Without Love, he says, a man were no better than such shrieking votaries of raging Bellona or the Mother of the Gods. Indeed, without Love, one were no better than the instruments of bronze or the noisy cymbals the pagans played, singing to their accompaniments lewd songs. This is the first reflexion of the writer suggested by the scene he is thinking of. The worshippers preceded by their priests have ascended the steps, and reached the porch (*prothuron*) and passed between its massive columns, through the lofty doorway into the vestibule (*pronaos*). There the people must wait, for only the priests may enter the shrine (*naos*) where the image stands. Outside the others remain in the outer hall of statuary and paintings awaiting the return of the priests from the shrine of the mysteries. And the writer reflects that *without Love* the knowledge of the true mysteries of the true God (1 Co 4¹) to which he has already referred in this letter, mysteries which far transcend in importance and spirituality and purity the most guarded and sacred secrets of the esoteric religions of the pagan world, and into which only the perfect (οἱ τέλειοι) were admitted, were nothing, not even the faith that could remove mountainous obstacles to good living. No illumination of spiritual light following the darkness of the most dread mysteries of the Grecian world, not even the inner illumination of the spirit of Christian prophecy, is of any avail even when following the most complete self-surrender without Love (vv.^{3, 4}). This is another reflexion of the writer. The sight of their mysteries may mean life¹ to the votaries of pagan cults, but they are nought without Love. Even we, who have the fuller and grander vision of the great realities that are eternal, we only see, as it were, reflexions in a mirror, and these at best obscure (ἐν αἰνίγματι),² because Love is not yet

fully ours, nor are we fully His. But when the imperfections of time have given place to the perfect realization that is to be, then we shall have the full distinct vision of Love face to face. His glory and beauty shall be revealed to us as clearly as our hearts have been revealed to Him, and we shall see and understand that Love is greater than all. This is the sublimest reflexion of the writer (vv.⁹⁻¹³). And he makes it as he stands in thought in the sacred shrine (*naos*), where only the priests and the initiated may enter, and where the divinity is supposed to be. Behind the shrine is the fourth compartment of the temple (the *opisthodomos*). Here the treasures are kept. Behind the shrine of Athena in the Parthenon was the public treasury to which Aristophanes refers (*Plutus*, 1193). There he places the statue of Plutus to guard the treasury (*opisthodomos*) of the goddess. Demosthenes (*c. Timocratem*) refers to the burning of this treasury by the defaulting treasurers. Behind the *naos* or shrine in the Temple of Diana was the richest and safest bank in the East. Accordingly, we may say that the four divisions of the Hymn correspond in character, position, and importance to those of the temple. We have four systems in it, each divided into three sections. The first system comprises the three opening verses beginning with 'if with the tongues of men,' and ending with 'I am nothing benefited.' It is a recital of Christian charismata and characteristics. This we might call the *prothuron*, or pillared portico. For it is on such pillars as prophecy, knowledge, faith that the Christian's life is uplifted, for faith is the foundation or supporting pillar³ of things hoped for, that which establishes logically the things unseen. 'Faith essentially deals with the future and with the unseen, the regions not entered by direct physical experience.'⁴ Here we stand before the door of the Temple of Love. In the second system the nature and character of Love are set forth in terms that recall the features of the Christ—the 'Love' of St. Paul. It begins with the words 'Love suffereth long' and concludes with 'never faileth' (vv.^{4-8a}). This is the vestibule of the Temple, for

clear in the same way, not through *enigmas* (ἐν αἰνίγματι), but clearly (ἐναργῶς). Euripides (*Rhesus*, 754), 'not in enigmas, for he speaks clearly' (σαφῶς).

³ ὑπόστασις, cf. Pindar, *Ol.* vi. 1. ὑποστάσαντες προθύρων κίονας—placing the pillars under the portico. Ez 43¹¹ of foundation of house. Cf. Ps 68².

⁴ Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 352.

¹ Soph., *Frag.* 719 (Dind.), 'Thrice happy they go to the world below having seen these mysteries. For them alone is life there, for all others there is misery'; cf. Plato (*Phædo*, 69) on the fate of the uninitiated.

² Æschines, *c. Ctesiph.*, contrasts the obscure and the

we have passed through the great door into the *pronaos*, and on the threshold of the sanctuary we listen to a rehearsal of the qualities and virtues of Love preparatory to entering the shrine itself. Now we enter the shrine (*naos*)—the third section. Here we see no image, no statue that might fall, for Love never *falls* nor fails,¹ but we stand in the presence of Reality. The shrine is empty of all the most coveted gifts—‘prophecies, tongues, knowledge’—and possessions of men. They have but temporary scope, but Love lasts for aye, invisible and eternal. Love only is here. His Presence, for we may regard Love as a portrait of Christ, is indicated in a subtle manner by the absence of all that is temporary and provisional. In the presence of Love these things appear to be but childhood’s toys or dreams (*τὰ τοῦ νηπίου*). They have served their purpose, we have no more use for them; but Love is eternal, and His purpose is ever to serve. ‘He that would be greatest of you will be your servant,’² as Love once said. This, the third system of the ode, begins with the words, ‘Whether there be prophecy,’³ and concludes with ‘I have put away the toys of the child’ (v.¹¹). Leaving the toys of childhood behind us we pass by a logical transition into the last of the compartments of the apostle’s muse. As in the *opisthodomos* at Ephesus and Athens the treasures were stored for safety behind the shrine; so here, in the Treasury of the Temple of Love, its *opisthodomos* are the true Treasures of Life; and we are reminded of what Love once said: ‘Treasure up for yourselves treasures in heaven’ (Mt 6²⁰). And the treasures are faith, hope, and love, which can only be won by those who have passed through the porch, vestibule, and shrine of Love, under whose sublime guardianship they dwell secure. When ‘face to face’ with Reality, Love Himself, we shall perceive at once that Love is supreme over all, even our faith and hope, which Love creates, unites, sustains. Our present view of Love is nothing when compared with the future vision. The very looking through the apartments of this vast temple is likened unto the gazing at their reflexion in the bewildering obscurity of a mirror, standing at gaze before ‘the boundless

rays of golden mirrors’⁴ We enjoy a sight, beautiful, indeed, but confused and dark when compared with the vision that is to be. The fourth and last section contains vv.¹²⁻¹³, 14¹, ‘pursue love’ and perhaps 12³¹, ‘the highest road of all.’

This analysis shows that the writer had a definite scheme before his mind. He did not compose his poem in a haphazard way, but gave much toil, study, and care so as to present it in its finished beauty and facile grace, a very triumph of the *ars celandi artem*, a veritable ‘God-built work’ as Pindar styled his ode. The metrical systems employed also show that the movement corresponds to the thought. The apostle’s evident knowledge of Plato’s description of Love (*Eros*) in the *Symposium*, 195–197, in rhythmical and balanced phrases, may explain why he chose to express himself similarly when dealing with a grander and holier theme. That St. Paul knew the passage can easily be shown. St. Paul personified *Agape*, as Plato personified *Eros*. ‘*Eros* neither injures (*adikei*) nor is injured’; *Agape* ‘rejoiceth not in injustice’ (*adikia*). *Eros* ‘does not show violent resentment,’ while *Agape* ‘is not provoked.’ *Eros* ‘is distinguished by *good form*,’ for there is war between ‘*bad form*’ and ‘*Eros*,’ while *Agape* ‘does not show *bad form*.’⁵ *Eros* ‘is master of pleasures and desires, showeth gentleness, removeth harshness, loveth to give friendliness, does not show hostility, is propitious to the good, observed by the wise, envied by those who have it not . . . is our pilot in labour, the adornment of gods and men, best of leaders whom every singer should follow.’ St. Paul implies the self-mastery of *Agape*, its freedom from envy and selfishness, its kindly offices. He might speak ‘with the tongues of men and angels,’ but without this ‘adornment of divine beings and men’ his words would only have the ring of brass. Plato *bade the singer follow Eros*; Paul bids the Christian pursue *Agape*. This theory of the Hymn also throws light upon, and is illuminated by, the words πάντα στέγει—the central idea and the central phrase of the poem. In Tregelles’ edition the chapter has twenty-five lines, and στέγει is the middle word of the thirteenth line. It may be regarded as the key to the understanding of the poem. R.V. and A.V. render ‘beareth all things.’ The verb is used of keeping out water, guarding secrets, being proof against spears. None of these passages gives the required sense, their meaning being expressed by

¹ πίπτει (NABC), ἐκπίπτει (Syr. and West.), cf. ‘standeth or falleth,’ πίπτει, Ro 14⁴; ἐκπίπτειν of shipwreck; hissing off stage.

² Mt 23¹¹, where μείζων ὑμῶν corresponds to μείζων τούτων in v.¹².

³ The singular is required by v.².

⁴ *Hecuba*, 924.

⁵ ἀσχημονεῖ—a Platonic word.

ὑπομένει, endures, and the condensed style does not admit of tautology. A messenger in Æschylus announces that the enemy are repulsed, and that the tower still *protects* the people. Antigone says, 'the battlements *protect* the city.'¹ Love can hardly be described as keeping out all things like water, or holding everything like secrets, or being proof against all things like spears, but it can be said to shelter and cover all things, in the sense of affording a universal shelter without prejudice or partiality, taking all under its protective wings, covering all with its roof (στέγη). This love that covers all things recalls Love's simile of the mother-bird gathering her chickens under her wings, and the invitation Love once gave: 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary, and I will give you rest for your souls' (Mt 11²⁸). We are reminded of a sheltering canopy, broad as the heaven above, wide stretched over all, to protect, cover, and defend. In the Father's house are many abiding-places but only one *roof* (στέγη), the Divine love that covers all men and things under the folds of its ample protection.

This supports the theory that the ode is constructed upon artistic and architectonic principles. Love is the royal dwelling or στέγη, like the residence of the Atreidai (Agam. 1055). Hecuba (1009) used the word of the treasure vaults of Athena which contained gold. Love is not only a royal dwelling, it is a treasure-house; it is more, 'it is a divine residence, a temple in the highest sense, a place set apart for work and worships. The abode of Love is one of the abiding-places (μοναί) of the Father's house (Jn 14²). For the halls of hope and faith and love abide (μένει) (1 Co 13¹³). Their treasure can never be stolen from those who have

¹ S. c. Theb. 794, στέγει δὲ πύργος. O. C. 15, πόλιν στέγουσι.

found a shelter under the *roof* of love (Mt 6^{20f.}). This ode, therefore, is a God-built work (θεόδοματον χρέος). It describes the Temple of Love, through whose many chambers we are permitted to pass, and of whose treasures we are admitted to a sight, which is brief or lasting in the same degree as we possess the Spirit of Love.

As we look back upon this little poem, a Greek ode in miniature, we notice the wonderful effects obtained by assonance and repetition. The changes are rung like musical chimes upon certain words and phrases² which recur at almost regular intervals, and which find echoes and responsions throughout. Professor Bury has pointed out the same phenomenon in the Pindaric odes. In the first verse the jingling effects of the words represent the sounds of the instruments. In the third verse *καυχῆσθωμαι* (NAB) is manifestly right. It is required to harmonize with words before and after which have *χ. καυθήσωμαι* is wrong; it introduces an inharmonious sound and an incongruous idea. It reads like a Western correction of the other word which is the connecting link between its own and the following section, where we are told that 'Love is no braggart' (v.⁴). The burnings at Rome under Nero (A.D. 64) and the reference to Dn 3⁸ (Theod.) obscured this point. The true parallel is in Appian's history, where an orator descends from the platform and offers himself³ to any one who wished to arrest him. The apostle says in 54 (Autumn), 'Though I give up my body to imprisonment, so that the boast be mine, but if Love be not mine, no benefit is mine.' Two and a half years after (May 57) he put himself into the power of his enemies. This pathetic and prophetic note is lost by the changing of one letter.

² e.g. 'If I have not Love' (3); 'Love' (4); 'it shall be done away' (4); 'child' (5); etc.

³ παρεδίδου τὸ σῶμα, see Wetstein.

Literature.

A BASIS OF BELIEF.

CONSTANTLY the rocks are being ground down and the land gnawed away, and yet the earth persists, and this because the streams keep no less constantly building up new lands, which gradually rise above the waters and form the homes of many generations.

And so though, theologically, this age of ours seems a time of cataclysm and destruction, the faith is wholly safe. For many eager minds, working on the task of reconstruction, are fashioning new wine-skins, so that, when the old so obviously wearing away do give, the precious wine may not be spilt. Here, for example, is Dr. Percy Gardner taking a

hand at it. He tells us that he has written *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d.) because the coming on of old age warns him that it is time to set down in final form the conception of Christian belief to which he has been led. But of ageing there is never a sign. Here are the alertness of outlook, the nimbleness of mind, the shrewd kindly eyes that scan us so closely, the subtle fingers that read the pulse of the time with uncanny accuracy, above all the sincere soul that, reverent to the past, still claims its right of coming to Christ direct and thinking Him out at first hand for itself—all indeed to which he has accustomed us. How wise is his protest that the ordinary Christian teaching about God needs 'infinite stiffening'; how natural his wonder at the flabby good nature we mistake for Holy Love, in view of the fact that 'never before in the history of the world were the workings of Divine righteousness so manifest'; how true his argument that, in recoil from the way of contemplation, our practical benevolence so fills our minds as to obscure the need of worship; how accurate his sense that Christianity and immortality and materialistic socialism are standing face to face, and the thing must be fought out. His favourite metaphor is that as an iceberg topples over and reveals a new side of itself, so from time to time must truth. He feels that the progress of relativity, of religious psychology, of the comparative study of religions, and the changed views of early Christian history make a restatement of the faith imperative. Moreover, he is sure that for the majority of folk the old metaphysical method has grown obsolete, that such speculations are to the average man a foreign language in which he cannot think. And in his attempted reconstruction he discards that, starts out from the facts of our own personality and experience as revealed to us by modern thought, and seeks to revise the creed in the light of history and psychology. Very arresting is his study under those powerful lights of the nature of personality, of the subconscious and the superconscious, of spiritism, of the claims of Spirit, and much else. Not a page but has its sentences that set the brain thinking hard, and not a chapter but rises at times into noble eloquence, as in that striking passage where he shows how man, seen and gone, can take his part in the vast process of creation which began before the earliest geological times and goes on into the infinite future. But the deeper the book wades,

it grows the more impressive, and it is when face to face with such central things as God and personality, and the Person of Christ, that it grips one the most. Dr. Gardner exults that God is holy and will in no wise bend His laws aside to make exceptions in our favour. He is not helped much by talk of the Absolute: 'as He is revealed to men He shows a side kindred to personality'; he knows that God is real because when we approach Him we have experiences similar to those we know when with the best of men, whereas 'if God were a mere subjective projection this would not happen.' But it is on Jesus Christ that Dr. Gardner meditates the most. He says that the Church is built up on the hyphen which connects 'the human and historic Jesus with the exalted and mystic Christ,' and with that launches out into his main theme.

He thinks that too many of us still know Christ after the flesh and not after the spirit, hence the worship, all too common, as he says, of Jesus, who is not worshipped by Paul, of Jesus, 'through the veil of whose life' we only dimly see that Eternal Christ who has been the real inspiration of the Church. You ask just what is this Eternal Christ? He answers, 'The side of God turned towards the world.' 'The eternal Christ is the immortal reality, of which the human Jesus was the reflection in the visible world.'

There is much beauty in this section of the work. But also not a little haze, which at times thickens almost to a fog. Nevertheless the sunshine of a very devout faith keeps breaking through.

EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

The Rev. Adam Fyfe Findlay, D.D., has a sane and sure mind. And therefore when in his Kerr Lectures he tells us that no one can really know a country who keeps only to its main thoroughfares, and with that makes for *Byways in Early Christian Literature* (T. & T. Clark; 10s.), we can follow with the comfortable assurance that we are in the hands of a reliable and clear-headed guide. This study of the early non-canonical writings is admirably done, like a bit of carpentry put together workmanlike out of clean, sweet-smelling wood. It is scholarly; it is thorough; above all it is lucid. It moves on like a clear, slow-flowing river. Embark on it, and, if it be new to you, you will find the country through which it winds full of interest. Even if it be familiar, Dr.

Findlay will hold your attention by the discussions into which the various landmarks lead him; the Jewish gospels bring him face to face with our Lord's baptism, the Petrine fragment with the descent into Hades; the gospels of the childhood run out into a little study of Mariolatry, the Acts of Thomas into one on the Sacraments and another on the Hymn of the Soul. And always, surely, it is moving to consider the various endeavours of these ardent followers of Christ to explain Him to themselves, and to translate Him into their particular thinking, attempts which we now see to be so obviously inadequate; and very humbling to remember that later generations will no doubt look back at our doctrines and our musings, which seem to ourselves so satisfactory and final, with the same puzzled look of wonder on their faces with which we read these old attempts, and the same sheer bewilderment that we should have missed so much that stares at us, and should have been so easily content.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND AFTER.

It is long since we learned to respect the weighty words of Mr. Claude G. Montefiore. Whether he speaks of Judaism or of Christianity, he has always to be listened to as one who has long and lovingly sought the truth. Once more he has put us all under a heavy debt by his massive and informing book, *The Old Testament and After* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). In successive chapters the first of which runs to two hundred pages in length, he deals with 'The Old Testament,' 'The Advance of the New Testament,' 'The Advance in Rabbinic Literature,' 'Hellenistic Contributions,' and 'What Liberal Judaism has sought and is seeking to achieve.'

The writer's purpose throughout is to emphasize such moral and religious features in these successive developments of the Hebrew spirit as are of value to us to-day. No critical scholar could be less concerned with the minutiae of criticism: the casuistical spirit has certainly not infected him. Therein lies part of the charm of the book, that, though it rests upon an accurate knowledge of an overwhelming mass of detail, it keeps to the big things, the things of abiding value for life.

Christian readers will rise from this book with a new appreciation of the Rabbis and of their enormous literary output, which is too often glibly assessed by those who have never examined it. For

the Rabbis, too, as Mr. Montefiore reminds us, 'had often their prophetic flashes and visions.' If in one aspect they were legalists, in another aspect they were humanists, and the latter aspect is persuasively presented in this book. Of no less interest are Mr. Montefiore's fine appreciations of Jesus, Paul, and the New Testament generally, and there is much that is illuminating here. Of the Fatherhood of God we read: 'We certainly do not get in the Hebrew Bible any teacher speaking of God and to God as "Father," "my Father," "your Father," and "our Father," like the Jesus of Matthew. We do not get so habitual and concentrated a use from any Rabbi in the Talmud. And this habitual and concentrated use rightly produces upon us an impression. By it we are led to believe all the more in the truth of the doctrine on which it rests. We are moved by it to wish that we, too, could feel that doctrine, even as Jesus teaches that we ought to feel it; and that we, too, could order our lives in its light and by its strength.'

Mr. Montefiore succeeds in making even the remote and abstruse Philo interesting; and in the last chapter he shows very clearly how deeply Liberal Judaism is rooted in the Old Testament as interpreted by modern criticism, and what to-day it stands for. To it the Jews are not a nation, but a religious community, and Zion and Jerusalem are terms of purely spiritual significance. The bearing of this on the Balfour Declaration is obvious.

EMERGENT EVOLUTION.

The Gifford Lectures in the University of St. Andrews were delivered last year by Emeritus-Professor C. Lloyd Morgan. They are now before the public in book form with the title *Emergent Evolution* (Williams & Norgate; 15s. net). We feel that we are not likely to do justice to Professor Morgan's position until the second course of his lectures is also in our hands. The present volume by itself is brimful of interest and instruction, but we must confess to some doubt as to what precisely the lecturer is aiming at or how he proposes to get there. The book strikes us as rather a series of separate papers—each of them very interesting—than an architectonic whole. Thus, for example, the chapter on Relativity is one of the clearest and most helpful accounts of that doctrine that we have seen, but what precisely is its function in the Professor's argument we do not see. In

brief, the argument of the lectures is plain and simple. The modern doctrine of evolution with its 'emergences' and 'nisus' is explained, and the author holds that all this is perfectly compatible with a theistic view. No one is likely to deny that. It has never been denied. The crassest 'naturalism' never did more than say that the conception of God was unnecessary. So far as we can see, Professor Morgan has no answer to that view. He himself prefers the theistic position, but that is all he can say. He does indeed think that by accepting God we attain 'a richer attitude of piety,' but that comes perilously near being a matter of taste. He will cherish no antagonism to anybody. 'There is not even the alternative "this" or "that." The alternative is, this world without God or the world, just as it is, but none the less dependent on God.' How this gets rid of the most fundamental of all antagonisms we fail to see.

THE MORAL LIFE OF THE HEBREWS.

A scientific study in English of the ethics of the ancient Hebrew world has for some time been overdue; we have it now in *The Moral Life of the Hebrews* (University of Chicago Press; \$2.25 net), from the competent pen of Professor J. M. P. Smith, of Chicago. In this carefully written book, whose argument is abundantly lucid, as every paragraph of it is numbered and appropriately titled, Professor Smith traces through successive periods, from pre-prophetic times to the second century B.C., the moral practices and ideals of the Hebrews. This study rests upon a clear appreciation of the literary history, though limits of space prevent the writer from dealing at much length with the social and economic conditions which inevitably affect the ethical development of a people. With entire scientific candour he unburies the crudities of the earlier period, some of which persisted more or less to the end: but the long story, whose ethics almost throughout have a more or less utilitarian tinge, discloses an ever-deepening appreciation of goodness.

There are many points of incidental interest. Professor Smith here again maintains the thesis he has advanced and defended in earlier books, that 'Hosea felt himself called upon by Yahweh to marry a notoriously bad woman and accordingly did so.' The 'wicked' in the Psalms he thinks to be on the whole idolatrous fellow-Jews rather than

pagans, and happily adduces the evidence of the Elephantine papyri in favour of this possibility. He presents a valuable discussion of the Servant of Yahweh problem in Deutero-Isaiah, suggesting that that great prophet is making use of the old idea of solidarity, but that he has purified and extended it to embrace the whole world. In the Book of Job he finds no trace of an expectation of vindication in a life beyond death. 'The splendour of Job's position lies in the fact that he remains true to himself and faithful to his ideals though he sees no solution to his problems, either in this life or in another.' The discussion of the Sages includes Ecclesiasticus as well as Proverbs. To most readers the most interesting chapter will be that on 'The Morals of the Egyptian Jews,' which gathers up from the Aramaic papyri discovered nearly twenty years ago the moral aspects of the Jewish-Egyptian life of the fifth century B.C., and presents them in a vivid way. The book is an adequate and valuable sketch of the moral development of the Hebrews.

A NEW BOOK ON ST. PAUL.

Professor F. G. Peabody of Harvard is well-known and highly valued in this country as the author of several books on the application of Christian principles to modern conditions, and perhaps even more, by preachers, for his suggestive meditations on texts in 'Mornings in the College Chapel.' He has now followed up his studies in the teaching of Jesus by an essay on Paul—*The Apostle Paul and the Modern World* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). Professor Peabody tells us that in the library of the Theological School at Harvard there are more than two thousand volumes dealing with Paul, but he justifies the addition of another on two grounds. One is that a great deal of light has recently been thrown on Paul's teaching by historical researches that were not primarily concerned with Paul at all, or even with Christianity, and the time has come to examine the bearing of this foreign material on Paul's teaching. Another reason is the attitude of the modern mind to religion. The attitude of mind to Jesus is that of admiring discipleship. He is the master of souls and not the source of dogma, claiming obedience rather than definition. But traditional orthodoxy is derived from the ideas of Paul, and especially from elements in him that cannot be regarded as permanent. And the problem to be faced in view

of these two facts is : in what light are we to regard this apostle ? Did he absorb and transform the Hellenistic influences of his time, or did they produce in him a new type of Christianity ? Was he a perverter of original Christianity, or its real founder ? or simply, in spite of all, a loyal interpreter of Jesus Christ ?

This is the problem Professor Peabody sets himself to solve in his new book. He endeavours to disentangle the timeless elements from the temporary, to detach the personality of Paul from the limitations of his environment, and to interpret the apostle in terms of the modern world. His plan is admirably simple, dealing in turn with 'The Man,' 'The Letters,' 'The Theology of Paul and the Modern World,' 'The Religion of Paul and the Modern World,' 'The Ethics of Paul and the Modern World,' and 'The Messenger and the Master.' It does not need to be said that the writer has mastered the wide literature of his subject or that his treatment is both fascinating and sincere. His book is not in any sense a strikingly original contribution, but it is full of good sense and marked by penetrating insight. It is inspired throughout by a genuine love of the Apostle and a sense of his greatness. And finally it does for the general reader an immense service. It shows how behind every important element in Paul's teaching there is a truth of permanent value. Some of the judgments in the book will be warmly disputed—his statement, *e.g.*, that for Paul Jesus was less than God. But these chapters will enrich the minds of students in many ways, and will (though the point of view is entirely modern) on the whole reassure them. It would not be easy to name any book better fitted to serve as an introduction to the study of Paul and Paulinism.

THE JESUS OF OUR FATHERS.

Those who occupy the extreme right wing of traditional orthodoxy have been asserting their position recently in various public ways. One of the criticisms passed on them by a well-known scholar in a lecture was that they produced no works of scholarship which would test the value of their views. There is one of them, however, who is not open to this charge. Dr. John W. Good, a Professor in the Georgia State College for Women, has written what is described by the publishers as a 'massive' work with the title *The Jesus of Our Fathers* (R.T.S. ; 25s. net). 'The point of view of

this monumental work,' we read on the cover, 'is the point of view of the plain man who devoutly believes that the divine nature of the Christ as the Son of God was made continually evident and positive from the annunciation to the crucifixion in the New Testament Scriptures.' This, however, does not do justice to the author for whom this truth of truths was made evident from the first page of Genesis. He occupies the standpoint of literal inspiration to which all the Bible is on one level and of equal value and authority. He knows the Bible thoroughly, and on the basis of his own view of it has written a study of the life and ministry of our Lord which is comprehensive and thorough. It has evidently been a labour of love, and it will prove helpful and instructive to those for whom the sufficient proof of a truth is that it is found written in the Word of God. The book reveals considerable ability and, what is better, a loyal devotion to the person of Christ.

THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY.

Mr. E. S. P. Haynes is still very unhappy ; he is quite sure that the world has taken a wrong turn, and he cannot get it off his mind. In *The Enemies of Liberty* (Grant Richards ; 6s. net) he returns to his complaint that, while we keep boasting of our liberty, in reality it is denied to us, and that what poor rags of it we have are being plucked away. For there are far too many fussy folk about, poking and prying into other people's business, regulating what is no affair of theirs, determined that those round about them must live not in accordance with the latter's own desires, but as they choose for them. Most of us, at times, have had an uneasy suspicion that something of that nature is uncomfortably true. But rarely, since Cain, can any one have cried out with such vehement protest that he is not his brother's keeper, as does Mr. Haynes, or asserted with such huge conviction that he will be obliged if other folk will kindly keep their hands off his concerns !

This is a frank and honest book, though probably these qualities do not cost Mr. Haynes very much. He is so sure that he is always right, and those who differ from him are sorry creatures. The picture left upon the mind is that of a sturdy figure settled squarely before the centre of the fire, laying down the law on every topic as it rises, with a raised and emphatic finger, talking much sound common sense, and much else with the same assurance, and

frequently mistaking prejudice for principle. And it is all rapped out with a hearty vigour and in terse vivid sentences. 'The typical modern Englishman,' he remarks, 'is too insensitive even to put cayenne pepper into his claret. He prefers methylated spirits.' There is a good dash of methylated spirits in this book.

THE MINISTER IN THE MODERN WORLD.

Is there any subject upon which more lectures have been given than the subject of preaching, and can there possibly be anything left for the gleaner in a field where so many giant reapers have toiled? Recent lecturers have felt driven into the byways, and in their desire for freshness of treatment they have failed sometimes, with all their brilliance, to do justice to the greatness of their theme. No such criticism can apply to the latest addition to the literature of preaching.

The Minister in the Modern World, by Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L. (Black; 3s. 6d. net), though modest in appearance, is a really great book. It consists of ten lectures on such themes as the inherent difficulties of modern preaching, the technique of the sermon, the psychology of preacher and congregation, the message to the man outside the Church, etc. These lectures are full of Christian thinking, nobly expressed. The preacher is called to view life as Jesus did, in its 'fundamental solemnity.' To the average modern view 'the landscape of most souls looks rather flat, with few peaks and few abysses, either in fact or in possibility. Most sins seem drab and grey, neither scarlet nor crimson. Crises in the spiritual life, according to our habitual judgement, are rare, and calamities far from irretrievable. . . . It is an untrue view, which I fear is begotten of our desire for comfortableness and of our fear of tragedy.' Some ministers 'seem to desire to convey the impression that they are just investigators of sacred truth, and have not passed beyond the stage of experiment. They give the impression that they would be ashamed to be known as the agents of a great rescue.' 'We must possess, perhaps I should say recapture, the note of urgency, spiritual and moral urgency. . . . The Bible is a book of urgency, haunted with the memory of moral tragedy and lit with the ardours of spiritual struggle.'

The subject of 'the minister as confidant and

counsellor' is handled with rare wisdom and illustrated with incidents drawn from a wide and ripe experience.

There is an interesting note on Paulinism. 'A brilliant scholar, responsible for the theological reviewing in the most trustworthy paper for reviews of books, said to me two years ago, "The next movement in theological thinking will be a re-study of Paulinism." He went on to say, "Nothing would do so much to promote a spiritual revival in our nation as for a man to arise who could expound what St. Paul meant by Justification by faith in terms such as the modern mind could understand."' These words are curiously reminiscent of a sentence which appeared in the *Times* Literary Supplement: 'Who can tell whether the coming revival of religion so confidently predicted in certain quarters may not be waiting for the time when we are able to respond more vigorously to the presentation of the Gospel most intimately associated with St. Paul?'

Dr. Gillie's lectures will stand comparison with the very best that has been done in this field, and the Christian minister will find in them real inspiration.

A FAMOUS HERESY CASE.

The Rev. J. H. Leckie, D.D., has devoted his skilled and fertile pen to a history of the 'Fergus Ferguson Case' in the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland; and he has produced a book of fascinating interest—*Fergus Ferguson, D.D., His Theology and Heresy Trial: A Chapter in Scottish Church History* (T. & T. Clark; 8s.). Many Scottish churchmen who have passed middle age will remember vaguely that there was such a case, and recall it as one of the minor disturbances of the ecclesiastical waters. It is not even mentioned in the biographies of Principal Rainy and Professor Robertson Smith, and one learns with surprise that Robertson Smith and Fergus Ferguson were tried in the same year. But Dr. Leckie successfully vindicates the importance of the Ferguson trial and its real place in the development of Scottish theological thought. For one thing, this was the first discussion in a Scottish Church Court of eschatological problems of a serious kind. But it was also the first definite challenge in the same quarter to the entire Calvinistic statement of Christian doctrine. And in both these respects the case had a fruitful influence on the forces which

were at work in leading the Scottish mind to a broader and more tolerant attitude in matters of doctrine. The Robertson Smith case had a more resounding fame, but it dealt with the issues and claims of Biblical criticism. The Ferguson case went deeper into the citadel of faith, and its results were at least as decisive. Few men in Scotland are more competent to describe the history and implications of such an event than Dr. Leckie, and he has written a book which will take an important place in the literature of Scottish Church life and thought.

THE ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF RELIGION.

Origin and Evolution of Religion, by Professor E. Washburn Hopkins of Yale (London: Humphrey Milford; 15s. net), is an excellent, we are almost tempted to say an important, book. It is a sound and scholarly work which may be trusted. The Professor evidently has thorough knowledge of his subject and all the most recent contributions of any importance that have been made to it. Only two points strike us as in any degree unsatisfying. We miss anything like adequate appreciation of the importance of a study of Prayer. The only reference to Prayer in a very full index is to one passage on prayers to the dead. Professor Hopkins is not alone in this strange neglect of the most universal manifestation of religion. Again, while we are grateful to him for so clearly and cogently showing up the fallacy of confusing a mere triad of deities with a real trinity, we are not quite persuaded that he has proved his case in exhibiting genuine trinities in Hinduism and Buddhism.

A book of a unique kind has been written on the relationships between war experiences and psychological theory. The writer is the Rev. W. N. Maxwell, M.A., and the title *A Psychological Retrospect of the Great War* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). Mr. Maxwell was a chaplain on active service, and gathered a rich harvest of experience among men of all ranks. He is also a competent psychologist, a follower of Dr. McDougall, and therefore a 'behaviourist,' not of the American school, but of one with a more 'spiritual' standpoint. His purpose in this book is twofold. He offers a reasoned explanation of the reactions of which men were

conscious in the environment of war and which they carried with them into peace conditions. And, further, he exhibits the War as a great educational experience, the results of which are still being felt. The general thesis of the book is that the conduct of men was due to certain instinctive forces, and this is illustrated in successive chapters on The War Impulse, on Sentiment at the Front, on the Herd Instinct, and Courage. The discussion is illuminated by many actual incidents, and interesting pages are to be found on such points as the effect of war conditions on the religious life and the influence which the War has had on the post-war conduct of returned soldiers. The book is an able and original contribution in a little occupied field.

Dr. Joyce Oramel Hertzler has a hospitable mind, but a sense of proportion has been rather markedly denied it. Whether it is altogether seemly to include Jesus Christ at all in *The History of Utopian Thought* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) is a matter of taste upon which minds may differ, though it involves the reader in the difficulty of not being sure whether He is to be included in the very free criticisms of the Utopians among whom He is given a place; but in any case to dismiss Him in eighteen pages, and Plato in a couple or so more, while Bellamy's 'Looking Backward' is allowed ten; to give the same space to Mr. Wells and Augustine, and such like things,—all that is surely proof of an odd standard of values, or rather none at all. Moreover, there is an obviousness about much of the more original section of the work which stumbles one. To have paragraphs beginning 'The Utopians are naturally also critics of their age,' and 'The Utopians also have a commendable faith,' with these trite remarks printed in italics, is not impressive. But there are better things than that in the book, which is a handy volume, with reading behind it, and not a little useful information set down in a convenient form.

In *Meditations from the Old Testament* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net), Miss K. W. Cohen has made a happy selection of verses, chiefly from the Psalter, which she has so connected and arranged under appropriate heads that they are well fitted to convey to others the comfort and help they yielded to the compiler. She writes as an invalid to invalids.

In *Shakespeare's First Folio* (Blackwell; 4s. 6d.

net) Mr. R. Crompton Rhodes gives us a masterly piece of patient and thorough scholarship, in which, dealing fully and interestingly with every one—editor, printer, licenser, pirate—whose hands came into contact with the plays of Shakespeare, he proves incontrovertibly how inexpressibly much we owe to Heminge and Condell, the great dramatist's two fellow-actors, who, disgusted by the maimed and pirated editions of their dead friend's works that were being published, issued the First Folio, and thereby gave to posterity our glorious inheritance of the real Shakespeare. How immense is our debt to them may be gathered by comparing the great soliloquy as we know it with this, the version of it given in the Quarto of 1603 :

'To be, or not to be, I there's the point.
To die, to sleepe, is that all? I all.
No, to sleepe, to dreame. I mary there it goes.
For in that dreame of death, when wee awake
And borne before an everlasting Iudge,
From whence no passeng'er ever return'd,
The undiscover'd country, at whose sight
The happy smile, and the accurs'd damn'd.'

This text would seem to have been put together by the actor who played Marcellus, for in the scenes where he appears it is accurate; and for the rest he drew upon his memory, and his imagination, where that failed. It is a fair specimen of the sad stuff from which the two 'pious fellows' delivered us. And in view of that it seems but scanty justice that they should have been pursued all too often, not with a hot gratitude, but a grumbling nagging of querulous criticism. Mr. Rhodes meets these objections by his theory, which he seems to prove, that the good men were not editors in the accepted sense who altered their colleague's works, but that they published the various prompt-books of the plays where these existed, or, when these had disappeared, put the plays together from the actors' parts. It is time that the carping at their heels should cease, and they be given the meed of thanks and admiration that is their bare due. For, without them, Shakespeare had not been our Shakespeare.

Economics for Christians, by Mr. Joseph Clayton (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net), is an eloquent and well-informed plea for Christian Socialism. The chapters of the book were published as occasional essays in various papers, but they have a

common purpose and a common conviction. The author, who is a Roman Catholic and a trade unionist, believes in the instinct for justice and goodwill in his fellow-men and appeals to this for a hearing. He believes that what ordinary Christians want is not goodwill but knowledge, and he provides this knowledge in his book. It is clearly written by a man who knows his subject and is all the more persuasive because he is fair and tolerant. Those who wish to know the case for a new industrial system based on co-operation and on production for social need will find that case stated here with sincerity and competence.

Nothing seems more difficult than to maintain the reticence of the Gospels in regard to the life after death. Our fathers painted the scenery of the eternal world after a fashion which they thought Biblical, and which doubtless satisfied their conceptions of the justice and mercy of God. To us many of the details of their picture are repulsive, so we hasten to cover our canvas with pleasanter scenery, forgetting that 'eye hath not seen nor ear heard.'

After Death, by Leslie D. Weatherhead (James Clarke; 5s. net), is a popular statement of the modern Christian view of life beyond the grave. The book, like so many others of the kind, took its rise amid the tragedies of the War. The writer has made himself familiar with the most recent literature on the subject, but his plough does not cut a very deep furrow, and he seems to lack somewhat of that sense of the awful mystery of death which imposes silence on more thoughtful minds. It is easy to say 'death will make so little difference that the scarcely-interrupted task of growing a soul will be continued'; but who knows? Following death comes an intermediate state, having two aspects, heaven and hell, both terminable. During this period the souls of the departed will have the fearful experience of watching their own past deeds working out consequences of good and evil in the generations that come after. If this be so, who may conceive the feelings of our first parents as they trace

the fruit

Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste
Brought death into the World, and all our woe?

The purgatorial experiences of this heaven-hell state lead on to the consummation of the ages,

when probably all souls will attain a destiny of bliss. Of the conditions of life in this final phase the writer 'cannot even hazard a guess,' and here he quotes the familiar lines of Richard Baxter :

My knowledge of that life is small,
The eye of faith is dim ;
But 'tis enough that Christ knows all,
And I shall be with Him.

One feels it had been better to have quoted these lines in their true connexion, as referring to the whole state after death, though that would have grievously shortened this book.

While there is much dubious speculation, the earnest Christian spirit of the writer is apparent throughout, his style is pleasing, and readers will find much that he has written both satisfying and comforting.

The Headmaster of Shaw Street Public School, Greenock, delivered a number of short addresses to boys and girls in Wellpark U.F. Sabbath School. These have now been published by James Clarke & Co. with the title *The Hidden Word* (3s. 6d. net). The introduction to the volume has been written by Professor Adams.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales has published three interesting booklets on Milton. *John Milton, Puritan, Patriot, Poet* (9d. net), is a very readable sketch of the career and works of Milton. It is arranged in a form suitable for Study Circles, and is admirably adapted for its purpose. The other booklets are *Master John Milton of the Citie of London*, by M'Ewan Lawson (6d. net), and *Scenes from the Life of John Milton*, by Professor Price and Miss Byles (1s. net). The latter is in the form of a play.

The State Murder of John Griffiths, by Mr. H. Bodell Smith (Daniel ; 1s. net), is a reasoned if passionate plea for the abolition of capital punishment, somewhat one-sided in its outlook, and not too surefooted in exegesis, but sane and readable. The most interesting argument is probably his concern for those upon the other side, of which we make a Botany Bay by dumping our criminals ; for doubtless they run amok yonder as they did here ! The author conceives that each of us wakens up after death much what we were and in a similar environment to this we know. This is his ingenious

answer to the argument that capital punishment is needed to keep down crime.

There is no more prolific pen engaged on the New Testament at present than that of Professor A. T. Robertson, M.A., D.D., of Louisville, Ky. His famous 'Grammar of the Greek New Testament' was almost sufficient to have occupied one man for a lifetime, but since it appeared book after book has come from him. The latest is a popular handbook on the Second Gospel : *Studies in Mark's Gospel* (Doran ; \$1.00 net). It is not a commentary or an exposition, but a series of essays in a popular vein on such topics as 'Mark's Gospel and the Synoptic Problem,' 'The Christ of Mark's Gospel,' 'The Teaching of Jesus in Mark's Gospel.' They are all quite good for their own purpose, which is to popularize the results of scholarship. The chapter on 'Peter's Influence on Mark's Gospel' would have been better if the writer had re-read Dr. Denney's page on the subject in 'Jesus and the Gospel.' But the book as a whole will be found interesting and useful.

The Rev. H. Schumacher, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Catholic University of America, has published the third volume of his *Handbook of Scripture Study* (Herder ; 8s. 6d.). It is a most comprehensive index, so to speak, of the problems that meet one in the reading of the New Testament. Questions of date, authorship, authenticity, and the like, as also difficulties raised by particular passages, all are dealt with, the various views concerning them summarized, and the authorities given. There is an astonishing mass of stuff packed into these pages.

Every scholar knows that in Gn 49, as in Dt 33, we have characterizations of the tribes rather than of the supposed individual progenitors of those tribes. Rev. Thomas Tully, M.A., while recognizing this, has, in *The Sons of Jacob and their Tribal Blessings* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s. net), claimed the preacher's right to treat the separate sayings of Gn 49 as character studies. He deftly handles the various types—the comfort-loving Issachar, the adventurous Zebulun—and makes us feel how modern they are. Mr. Tully must have convinced those who heard these Sunday afternoon addresses that the days of Genesis are not yet over.

Over commentator and translator alike the Book

of Job exercises a perpetual fascination; and Principal A. H. Mumford, B.D., in *The Book of Job: A Metrical Version* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), offers a translation in varying metres adapted to the changing moods and arguments of the discussion. Much of the verse is really musical and runs along with great ease and naturalness. This is all the more remarkable, as Principal Mumford has, throughout most of the book, set himself the almost inconceivably difficult task of writing a rhymed translation. Under such conditions exact accuracy has, at certain points, inevitably to be sacrificed, but there are genuine compensations in the pleasant and melodious lines which abound on every page. Later additions to the Book, such as the Elihu speeches, are removed to the end, so that we have in this translation a real approximation to the original book, both in its dramatic development and in its music. Here is the Principal's version of 38⁸⁻¹¹:

Who shut up the sea within doors when, like to a
babe at the birth,
It burst full-born from the depth and broke from
the womb of earth,
When naked it came to the light and I cradled it
in the land,
And I spun the mist for its vesture and the cloud
for a swaddling band,
When I broke the coast for its door-ways, when I
barred its advances and said:
Hitherto shalt thou come and no further, and here
shall thy proud waves be stayed?

Professor Peake has written a profoundly interesting introduction on the Significance of the Book of Job: introduction and translation alike will be welcomed by all who love and who desire to understand one of the greatest books of the world.

There are several good histories of the Hebrew people, and one or two of Old Testament Literature. The distinctive feature of Professor I. G. Matthews' *Old Testament Life and Literature* (Macmillan; 12s. net) is that in it those two interests are skilfully blended, and we are made to see how the literature runs *pari passu* with the political development. The book is written on the basis of the assured results of criticism, and is in all respects thoroughly up to date, in some points even advanced, Ezra being placed, for example, after Nehemiah, somewhere about 398 B.C. The story is carried from the

days of ancient Babylon and Egypt down to 135 B.C., and it conveys a vivid impression of the Hebrew men and movements, as interpreted by sane criticism. The value of the book is considerably enhanced by an elaborate chronological chart, illustrative of Hebrew political and literary history and of contemporary history in the Oriental world.

We are unfortunately becoming accustomed to the anomaly, which so roused the wrath of Lord Tennyson, of priests of a religion who cannot read their own sacred books. The fact that the study of classical Greek has fallen from its former high estate has had a reflex adverse influence on the study of New Testament Greek. In these circumstances, Dr. J. Gresham Machen has done a notable service to the Church in publishing *New Testament Greek for Beginners* (Macmillan, New York; \$2.20). The book is exactly what it professes to be. The author writes not as a scientific grammarian but as a teacher of long experience. The Grammar is admirably adapted for class use but will be equally useful to the private student. Difficulties are fairly faced; explanations are lucid; illustrations and vocabularies are plentiful. While the book assumes no previous knowledge of Greek, the ground is covered with sufficient thoroughness to give the student a real grip of the grammar. Throughout most of the exercises the author has wisely avoided quotations from the New Testament, as the reader's knowledge of the English text might give him a misleading impression of his knowledge of the Greek. The print, the spacing, the binding, and the whole appearance of the book are as attractive as the contents. In future editions, more frequent indications of the quantity of vowels would add to its usefulness.

Though the material of the book is some fifty years old, there is a topical interest in a small volume by the late Mrs. E. A. Finn, M.R.A.S., *Palestine Peasantry*, just published (Marshall Brothers; 1s. 6d.).

The object of the book, the material of which has been arranged mainly from articles which appeared in the 'Leisure Hour' many years ago, is to show that the lack of national unity among the people, their dense ignorance, and their very backward condition would make the grant to them of any measure of self-government a dangerous

experiment. The author points out that the Fellaheen, the agricultural peasantry, are broken up into clans which are antagonistic to each other, and endeavours to prove that these clans are the present-day descendants of the aboriginal tribes against whom the Israelites warred. In support of this theory she brings forward much evidence, the most interesting part of which is perhaps that in which she shows that many customs, expressly prohibited by the Mosaic Law, still exist as customs among the Fellaheen.

Church union is so much in the air that on all hands movements are taking shape for giving it practical fulfilment. In Canada the long-delayed consummation of a union between Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Wesleyans seems near at hand. Scottish Church union is now a certainty. The approach of Churches in England to one another is full of promise. In America, too, the subject is occupying a large place, and Dr. Newman Smyth, a leading Congregationalist, has just published a most interesting historical narrative of the inception, development, and present position of a movement, begun as far back as 1882 and continuing, with several checks, to grow towards the desired end. The story is rendered more instructive by the frank discussion of the present situation and the future prospects of the movement with which Dr. Smyth concludes his narrative. The title of his book is *A Story of Church Unity*: including the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops and the Congregational-Episcopal Approaches (Milford; 4s. 6d. net).

A collection of 200 Hymns for Students, with the Staff notation and also the Tonic Sol-fa notation, has been published by Mr. Humphrey Milford for 8d. net. It is the Student Christian Movement Edition. The title of *Hymns of the Kingdom* has been given to the collection.

A word in defence of the 'Fundamentalists' in America has been uttered, by whom, do you think? By Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale, one of the most scholarly of the modern school of critics! He has just published his 'James Wesley Cooper' Lecture on *The Teaching Ministry for To-morrow* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). He points out that 'Fundamentalism' is in essence a protest against the Liberalism that takes the soul out of the Gospel. Its error is in

substituting an impossible view of the Bible and of dogma. The real answer to this irreligious liberalism is a demonstration that the modern view of the Bible is loyal to the gospel of Paul, and this demonstration ought to be given by the ministers of our churches. The lecture is an eloquent plea for a real teaching ministry, and ought to be widely circulated. Professor Bacon is both a Higher Critic and an Evangelical, and has earned the right to speak on his subject.

Proof of the Existence of God, by Mr. Charles Edward Pell (Palmer; 7s. 6d. net), is a good book to put into the hands of any one who is inclined to think that the sacred word 'evolution' has made the word 'God' almost unnecessary. It shows pungently how the dogmatic unbeliever in his account of Nature is constantly compelled to bring back the language of teleology and attribute to something which he calls 'nature' all the attributes of God. Then the author shows that such a view of evolution as makes progress depend on 'chance' variations is grotesquely untenable. He has an acute and clear mind and can say clearly what he means. His argument gives the impression of being irresistible, and as believers we agree with his conclusions. If, however, we were disposed to take the part of *advocatus diaboli*, we should say that the argument is a little too strong to be convincing. Mr. Pell scarcely does justice to the many modifications which the doctrine of evolution has undergone especially in recent years. He does not even mention, so far as we have noticed, the term 'emergence,' which has become so important. Nor does he seem to realize the real weakness of Paley's argument which he attempts to strengthen. Finally, we would say that the real task for faith to-day is to combat not the atheism but the pantheism to which some men of science are prone, and our author's argument does not apply there.

A collection of the shorter poems of Wordsworth has been made by Mr. John Hawke. The volume, bound attractively in green cloth, has been published by the Religious Tract Society at the very reasonable price of 2s. 6d. net. The title is *The Homeland Wordsworth*.

The story of *The Bible, and How It Came to Us*, often told before, is briefly but interestingly told again by Mr. F. G. Jannaway (Sampson Low;

rs. 6d. net), whose method is to begin with the Revised Version and to move backward till he reaches the ancient manuscripts, specimen pages of some of which are beautifully reproduced. The book is needlessly disfigured by foolish remarks about the Higher Critics, who are described as the enemies of Christ.

The Rev. Canon Sell, D.D., M.R.A.S., has brought out a fourth, enlarged, edition of *The Historical Development of the Qur'an* (Simpkin, Marshall; 6s. 6d. net). Everybody knows that the Suras are not given in their chronological order; and this treatise, in amending that, becomes an informing study of the prophet's mental history, and of the various phases through which he passed. Particularly telling is the record of his own deterioration in character, or that of the cooling of his friendliness towards Jew and Christian, till his original amity became intolerance. On the other hand, the sensual descriptions of Paradise are all early, and they were outgrown and left behind.

Work, Play, and the Gospel, by Malcolm Spencer, M.A. (Student Christian Movement; 4s. net), is a plea for a new evangelism to meet the needs of the present generation. The aim is admirable. It is 'not in any way to discredit the evangelist's aim of bringing individuals to a personal experience of God through Jesus Christ; it is rather to show that there are a thousand avenues by which the beginnings of that personal experience may be acquired.' The writer obviously has in his view the student world, whose lines have fallen unto them in pleasant places, who have been nursed in the lap of the Church, who have their books and their art, their tennis and their dances; and he strives to show how, through all of these, they may come into touch with Christ. It is a great thing to teach the young the naturalness and beauty of religion, but a one-sided presentation of truth may come dangerously near to error. Here games have a disproportionate value assigned to them in the religious education of the young. 'You can teach him to play himself right through the gateways into the Kingdom of God.' Sin and the sense of guilt are minimized. 'The modern need is typified by the boy who has made a sorry mess of his scout-mastership through thoughtlessness, or the girl who is disabled by her sense of instability and

ineffectiveness.' Surely there are grimmer facts than these, even in the student world. A chapter is given to 'The Basal Elements of the Gospel,' in which Christ is presented as the ideal, without a hint that He died for the ungodly. It would not be unjust to say that the book is more an exposition of the Greek idea of culture than the Christian idea of redemption. As a protest against the narrowness of the older evangelism it is excellent, but it is confessedly not the whole Gospel; and whether it is a Gospel adequate to the needs of youth may be gravely doubted.

We have received from Messrs. Thomson & Cowan, Blythswood Square, Glasgow, a copy of their first publication. It is a short study of Hebrews xl. 24-27, by the Rev. T. N. Tattersall, the minister of Adelaide Place Baptist Church, Glasgow. The study is well worth publishing. The title is *The Man who refused a Kingdom*.

Meredith complained that the English people could not appreciate allegory. It may be largely the fault of the reader, but sometimes at least it is the fault of the allegory. Dr. Thomas Hall Shastid knows that if an allegory is to be read it must in the first place be interesting, and as readable as an ordinary romance. He has certainly succeeded in making his own attempt at an allegory readable. There is not a dull page in it. It conveys at the same time a good deal of accurate and interesting information. But as an allegory we do not like it. To begin with, Dr. Shastid takes a historical figure and makes him allegorical. Simon of Cyrene is treated as the representative of the Jewish race throughout its long history. Opinions may differ, but ours is that this is not wise. Then the story of the Jews is far too long to go into one volume of this kind. Also we have to express our astonishment that Dr. Shastid makes Simon come under Greek influence before he has reached Egypt! He warns us indeed not to read the book as a condensed history of the Jews, but this ignores chronology too completely. Further, we do not like Dr. Shastid's vocabulary in many places. Why write 'strook' for struck, or 'braken' for broken? In spite of such-like faults, it is a book that one will not lay aside easily. The title is *Simon of Cyrene, Dimachærus Splendens; or, The Story of a Man's (and a Nation's) Soul* (George Wahr).

The Reticence of God.

BY THE REVEREND A. D. BELDEN, B.D., WESTCLIFF-ON-SEA.

THERE are few experiences of the human soul that present so sharp a test of character or are so apt to tempt one to bitterness as the experience of what is sometimes called the Silence of God. This experience is so common that it accounts perhaps more than anything else for the disappointment that so many people feel in regard to religion. They attempt for a while to lead a religious life, but find the element of Divine response so curiously lacking that they conclude either that there is nothing in it, or that if there is anything in it it is not for them. A better understanding of both the nature of God and of man might lead, however, to a very different conclusion.

(1) *The deserted Soul*.—The Hebrew Scriptures are interestingly frank in the presentation of this experience. One recalls Job's pathetic cry, 'Oh that I knew where I might find him!' or the bitter cry of the writer of the 88th Psalm, 'Lord, why castest thou off my soul? Why hidest thou thy face from me?' This is the cry of a soul that feels desperately the apparent unhelpfulness of God. For other men the arm of the Lord may have been made bare; Joseph and Moses and David and Elijah may have found the heavens opened and Divine succour poured forth, but for him the heavens are brass, God is silent and inactive—so silent and so inactive that the man feels forsaken. God has cast him off. God has hidden His face from him. And some who read these words will feel that this man speaks for them.

(2) *An elusive God*.—This reticence on God's part is presented in a variety of ways in other passages of the Old Testament. One of the most important instances is the story of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, the definite departure of God, as it seems to suggest, from a man's soul. There is the story of Elijah, who failed to discover God in the earthquake or in the fire, but found Him instead in that sound that was no sound, the sound of a gentle stillness. There is the exhortation of the prophet, 'Seek ye the Lord—while he may be found, Call ye upon him—while he is near,' the suggestion being that God has His absences, His times of concealment. There is the yearning cry of Ps 42, 'As the hart panteth after the water-

brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God.' God seems hard to come at. He is elusive. 'Oh that thou would'st rend the heavens and come down' is the appeal of a soul to whom God seems to be very far away. We all know occasions in life when we find in God this terrible reticence—times when it seems as though the world might use towards us Elijah's cruel taunt concerning Baal, 'Cry aloud . . . either he is musing, or he is gone aside, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked.'

(3) *Standing at the Door*.—In vivid comparison with this point of view we may set the attitude of the New Testament. Here, of course, God declares Himself in Christ entirely sensitive and responsive to human need. We may say, indeed, that the Old Testament is a record of man's cry for God. The New Testament is the record of God's answer. Yet it would be a careless reading of the New Testament which failed to detect that God's answer has in it an element of restraint. It is perhaps well represented in that little sentence put into the mouth of Jesus by the writer of Revelation, 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock.' God stands at the door of every life, but—He knocks. Yet this very reticence of God, the very difficulty that we have in realizing Him, is in a sense the very reason for the Gospel, it is the *raison d'être* of the Incarnation. Jesus came to 'declare' God. 'No man hath seen God at any time, but the only-begotten Son, who was in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' In Christ, therefore, we ought to be able to discover a way in which this reticence may be overcome—overcome, that is, by being understood. Speech is silvery and silence is golden, and we have all known experiences in which silence has spoken, like action, louder than words; but it must be a silence that is understood. As we strive therefore to share the mind of Christ concerning God, we discover that there are three degrees in the Divine reticence.

(4) *Is God humble?*—There is first of all a *Divine reticence due to Divine character*. It will be perhaps quite a novel question for the reader to ask himself, but it is one well worth asking, for it takes us to the heart of the matter, 'Is God humble?' or, to

use a more daring word, though, of course, in its best sense, 'Is God shy?' We ought not to shrink from such a question in view of what we know of the character of Jesus, the meek and lowly of heart, who revealed a real dread of the acclamations of the crowd and the blatant popularity that His miracles might all too easily win for Him. 'Tell no man that I am the Christ.' He shows a love of indirectness, almost of disguise. 'Let not your left hand know what your right hand doeth' is part of His teaching. 'Seek not the chief seats at the feast.' 'The first shall be last and the last first.' 'I am among you as one that serveth.' One is reminded, by the whole atmosphere that Jesus discloses, and discloses as a revelation of God, of that strong tradition concerning fairies which says that these exquisitely beautiful creatures are as shy as they are beautiful and flee from the gaze of the curious. They are said to show themselves only to children. They have a divine humility. One is reminded of certain words, 'Except ye become as children ye shall not see . . .' Is not this personal disinterestedness a fundamental demand of ours upon ideal character? Is it not, after all, the measure of the purity of life? In the best men it becomes painful. In God it becomes an ingenuity of indirectness.

(5) *By-productism*.—Is this why all the best things in the universe are by-products, as though God were determined never to be caught directly at work? When we see Him most vividly it is as a man, a carpenter, a Crucified. A friend of the writer was once walking with a very gifted theological professor, a man who knew God intimately, and as they walked they spoke of knowing and seeing God, when suddenly in a voice of tremulous enthusiasm and awe, the professor turned to my friend and exclaimed, clutching him by the arm, 'There! Did you see Him?' He was pointing to a girl who had picked a little boy out of the road on which he had fallen and was busy cleansing him of the mud and wiping his tears away. 'Did you see Him?'

As Evelyn Underhill has so beautifully sung:

I come in the little things,
Saith the Lord:
My starry wings
I do forsake,
Love's highway of humility to take;
Meekly I fit my stature to your need.
In beggar's part
About your gates I shall not cease to plead—

As man, to speak with man—
Till by such art
I shall achieve My Immemorial Plan,
Pass the low lintel of the human heart.

This is the first reason for God's reticence. He is reticent as Christ was reticent, because true love is always humble and does not force its way. Why are we so slow to take Jesus as the truth about God? This means, of course, that, like Elijah, we shall do well to look for God not in the big things such as thunder and earthquake and fire. These things are too obvious, and scarcely subtle enough for His work.

And His that gentle voice we hear,
Soft as the breath of even,
That checks each fault, that calms each fear,
And speaks of heaven.

(6) *The Room-maker*.—The second degree of Divine reticence that we may distinguish is that which is dictated by *reverence for human personality*. Strictly speaking, this is the reason of the former. The explanation of God's humility is to be found in His purpose for man. As the Psalmist exclaims, 'Thy gentleness (restraint) hath made me great.' There is no more vital necessity for the development of human character than the provision of an area of life in which that character can exercise itself in responsibility. Why is it that the son of a man of genius is so often a fool? The answer is very simple. The genius keeps all the ground, spreads himself over the whole situation. By his very brilliance he blinds his child, by his very greatness dwarfs him. He overcrowds surrounding personalities. God is too great a father, too perfect a genius, to behave thus. As Browning says, 'He leaves room for the newly-made to live.' 'So speak ye, and so do,' cries the Apostle James, 'as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.' As a child grows a wise parent retreats, helps less rather than more, and even then mainly by invitation. He becomes inevitably more reticent.

(7) *Use your own Resources*.—But when under certain very distinct conditions it is wise and safe to lay that reticence aside, *the communion that results is all the richer in meaning and in value for the previous restraint*. If God has not answered you, may it not be in order that you may open your eyes a little wider and look round a little more carefully? Like Abraham of old, you may find that the Lord has already provided—there is a ram caught in the thicket. God is silent, not in order

that you may fail of help, but that you may become bigger and stronger in the exercise of your gifts. He says, No, not because He has a grudge against you, but because He is so jealous for your best development. We find this reticence everywhere evident in the practice of Jesus. He does not heal without the fullest co-operation of those that appeal to Him. He is for ever thrusting responsibility upon the human soul. 'Go, and sin no more,' He says, suggesting that there was much more power for resisting temptation in that soul than that soul had hitherto believed. Possibly she had often weakly cried to God for strength whilst failing to rally her own will in loyalty to His command. What she needed to learn above all was her responsibility for her own condition. If God is reticent in your experience, ask yourself solemnly, Why is He silent? Is His silence but a form of counter-asking? Let me examine myself again. Where am I failing? Where am I lacking? Dare I accuse God of being insufficient for my needs whilst I am careless of my duty?

(8) *God's enforced Silences.*—A final consideration in regard to this great matter is that there is a *Divine reticence forced upon God by human unworthiness and sin*. This, of course, has been already hinted at in the foregoing, but it needs to be stated more strongly. It is possible for whole religious communities, indeed for the trend of a whole religion, to become so intrinsically false that God cannot give Himself spiritually to it. That little sentence previously quoted, 'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock,' it is worth remembering, was addressed not only to the individual, but to the church of Laodicea, a church that was double-minded, neither hot nor cold, centred in itself, prostituted to the service of the world. In a

very terrible picture by one of our great artists this situation has been drawn with great and vivid power. Before a massive temple of glorious architecture—with its doors fast shut, and upon which He knocks in vain, is a figure bowed with anguish, crowned with thorns. It is the Crucified! Even in Christianity it is terribly possible for the situation in which Jesus found Himself in regard to the Pharisees to be repeated. 'This people honoureth me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me.' 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, how oft would I have gathered you as a hen gathereth her chickens beneath her wing, and ye would not.'

Are we obeying Christ? Is the modern Church right socially? Is she a plain demonstration in actual life and conduct of the laws that should govern the Kingdom of God? If not, how can God be fully revealed in her? 'If a man love me, he will keep my commandments; and we will love him, and will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' God must yearn for free and open and full relationship with His human children. He has nothing to fear from hearts as humble as His own, as passionately set upon service as Himself, whose natures are ever seeking to reflect His own. But if He is to come, such room must be made for Him. The Lord of forgiveness must find for dwelling-place a heart that itself forgives. 'Blessed are the merciful: for they shall receive mercy.'

Is this why God is as yet so unreal in our modern world, in our churches, in us? Do not these considerations give us furiously to think? No wonder Jesus began His preaching with the cry, 'The kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel.'

Jesus' Thought of Prayer.

BY THE REVEREND J. M. SHAW, D.D., PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS AND SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY
IN THE PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

I.

ONE of the most striking things about Jesus' teaching as recorded in the Gospels is the literally unlimited possibilities assigned in it to believing prayer. Take, for example, that saying of His

recorded in each of the first three Gospels, and in different contexts: 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.'

We are apt to dismiss such a saying as mere

rhetoric or hyperbole. Jesus, we say, was using a familiar figure or metaphor to express truth in a picturesque and striking way, after Oriental fashion. But this is too facile an explanation, for merely to leave it at this is to miss the ground-thought back of this and such-like sayings of the Master. No; the explanation has to be found in Jesus' whole view of God and the universe. The thought in Jesus' mind was this: that the world is at heart a moral and spiritual universe, 'My Father's'; brought into existence at the first and continued in existence, and energized by Divine redemptive energies, for the sake of the realization of Fatherly ends with His children. At the heart of this beating, pulsing world is a living, loving Heavenly Father, a controlling Fatherly Providence, actively at work in the world and free to operate even through the laws of the world—for what we call the 'laws of nature' are but the basal method of His providential working—for the realization of Fatherly purposes. Because of this, the man who dares to trust utterly in God has behind him the whole force of the universe. So that wherever we find a man linked with God the Father in unwavering faith or trust, there we have a power the possibilities of which are unlimited. This is why Jesus was always saying to His disciples, 'Have faith in God.' 'All things are possible to him who believes.' His view of God and of faith belong together; the one is the proper correlative of the other.

II.

Such a faith or trust in God was the central thing in Jesus' own life, and the secret of His wonderful character and work. It was the explanation, in particular, of what we call His 'miracles.' These we are apt to account for by the fact that He was the Son of God, and, as such, exercised Divine power for the accomplishment of His purposes. But not so did Jesus Himself represent the case. He traced all back to His unwavering faith and trust in God the Father. 'The Father . . . he doeth the works.' The uniqueness of His working, on His own representation, was due to the uniqueness of His faith. See Him, for example, and most strikingly, in contact with death: receiving the news of the fatal ending of the sickness of Jairus' daughter whom He was on the way to heal, yet going on in the face of the news, undismayed and undaunted, believing that God was able, in

answer to prayer, to raise her from the dead; or meeting the funeral procession of the widow of Nain's son and stopping it, nothing doubting that God could bring back the boy to life; or, most striking of all, going out to the tomb of the buried Lazarus, commanding the friends to roll away the stone from the tomb, and, before the miracle actually took place, raising up His heart to God in thanksgiving for the answer that was to come to His prayer. More wonderful than the miracle itself in each case was the faith, the utter and absolute trust in God the Father, which made the miracle possible.

Such utter and unquestioning confidence in the power and willingness of God to answer prayer was a new thing, a new phenomenon, in human history. It was the perception of this that led the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, even after his great roll-call of the faithful under the Old Testament dispensation and the tracing of the secret of their lives to their faith in God, to go on in the following chapter to speak of Jesus as the 'beginner' or 'pioneer,' as Moffatt translates it, as well as the 'perfecter' of faith (He 12²). What did he mean? He meant that Jesus made a new beginning in the life of faith. He blazed a new trail, so that in Him and in His faith there appeared a new thing in history. And when we ask what this new thing was, the answer is: It was His unlimited and unquestioning trust in omnipotent Father-love at the heart of things. For the first time in history there appeared on earth One who absolutely trusted the Fatherhood of God, One who, as Principal D. S. Cairns has expressed it, 'had utter confidence that Love was at the heart of things, utter confidence also in the Absolute Power of that Absolute Love and in the liberty of that Love to help Him.' Such faith and such prayer enabled God to act greatly; and whenever such faith and such prayer are exercised there, Jesus taught, we may expect on God's part an equally great response. For the law of the Father's working is this: 'According to your faith be it unto you.'

III.

Now, if we ask why this is the law of the Divine response, and why God thus conditions His working and the bestowal of His gifts on believing prayer, this again flows from His Fatherhood. So far from being strange or arbitrary, this is in line with God's method everywhere. It is, indeed, but one

illustration or exemplification of a universal principle of God's working, a principle or law which may be stated thus: That God conditions the bestowal of His blessings on the co-operation or working along with Him of His children.

It is so in the natural world. God conditions the bestowal of the 'gifts of nature' on our co-operation, so that the earth will not yield its harvest without man's labour. It is so, too, in the intellectual world; in the field of scientific discovery, for example. God does not publish abroad His truth in the sky, so that we have but to open our eyes to see it. Only when we give ourselves to intellectual toil do we give God the chance to reveal to us the knowledge of His laws for our own and others' benefit. This is wherein consists the chief responsibility of our gifts or talents. 'If my hand slack, I should rob God.' And what is true in the natural sphere and in the intellectual is most of all true in the moral and spiritual sphere. Here, above all, God conditions the bestowal of His blessings on man's co-operation in faith and prayer.¹ Just as in the natural world, unless men work, God will not bestow His material blessings; and as in the intellectual world, unless men think, God will not bestow His blessings of truth: so in the moral and spiritual world, unless men pray, God is hindered in the bestowal of His greatest gifts and in the realization of His deepest purposes.

And if we ask why this is so, the answer is that it is not because of any unwillingness or lack of willingness on God's side, as if through our entreaties we could turn Him to a better mind. That, said Jesus, is a pagan or sub-Christian view of prayer. 'They think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.' Rather it comes of God's very

¹ This is very helpfully worked out in H. E. Fosdick, *The Meaning of Prayer*, ch. iv.

Fatherliness, and of the greatness of His Fatherly purposes for His children. For a fundamental consideration in this matter of prayer, as in all God's dealings with His children, is that God, being the kind of Father He is, is more concerned for His children's good than for their pleasure, for His children's character than for their immediate comfort. If in the natural world God gave the material blessings of life without man having to work for them, where were the opportunity for the development of the physical side of his being? If in the intellectual world God revealed the blessings of truth without man having actively and energetically to think and investigate, where were the opportunity for the development of the intellectual side of his being? So, in the moral and spiritual world, if God bestowed His blessings on ourselves and others without our having to pray for them, where were the opportunity for the development of character—in particular, of that childlike faith and trust and surrender which, after all, is the fundamental condition of glorifying God and doing true service to our fellow-men? It is not that prayer changes God's mind and will, or turns Him to a greater willingness to bless; it is rather that prayer provides the conditions which give God the opportunity to realize His willingness and to bestow His gifts in such a way as that, when received, they shall be used for His glory and for our own and others' good.

So it comes to this: Prayer truly conceived in terms of Jesus' thinking is *the opening of our lives to a Father-God, so that He may have the opportunity to realize His will and purposes in and through us*. It is the means, not of trying to get from God what we want, but of enabling God to give us what He wants. 'Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask Him. After this manner, therefore, pray ye . . .'

In the Study.

A Prayer.

O GOD our Father, Who hast made us, and Who knowest how these frail hearts of ours are caught and held by every vivid trifle, how in the dust and din and bustle of our crowded days we are jostled

far away from Thee, how half a hundred clamorous nothings to which we must attend fill our small minds and leave no room in them for Thee, now that, escaped for a little from the roar and noise of the world, with a thick door swung between us and our usual distractions, we can have a breath-

ing space, can sit in stillness, and have time to think, and to be cool, and to recall Thee to our minds again, be pleased in Thy great kindness to heal the fever and the fretting of our souls, to take from us all that offends Thy holy eyes, that being pure in heart we may see God. Make Thyself real to us, so near and real that we cannot but recognize Thy Presence with us. And being in it, knowing ourselves face to face with Thee, may we not fill the holy place with a babble of our vain talk and our own foolish desires ; but, bowed in reverence, wait with hushed hearts for Thy voice to us. Speak, Lord, for Thy servants hear.

Virginibus Puerisque.

How to be Happy.¹

'The time of the singing of birds is come.'—Ca 2¹².

It's a great time when the birds come back, and the summer is full of their happiness and singing ! They are game little fellows, aren't they, who start the day in great heart and the best of spirits, as you do yourself, you who waken up all of a piece and altogether ! One moment you are fast asleep and the next you are bolt upright, with your eyes quite round and big and wide and never a sign of sleep in them : this second you are sound as sound can be, and in a trice you are tootling on that trumpet, or already you have dragged your favourite tattered book from under your pillow and are crawling over Daddy in his bed, thumping him hard, and crying, 'Read to me !' And he, who only wakens bit by bit, beginning at his toes and reaching his head last, growls and grunts, and opening half an eye tries to read with that, for indeed he knows the story pretty well by now—though if he makes the least mistake you always catch him—and keeps the other one and a half eyes tight shut and tries to sleep with them ! But the birds are like you ; as soon as they waken they are up and singing, you can hear them long before you rise. There's a blackie ; and that's a thrush ! And out on the moors the grouse are calling, 'Go back ! Go back ! Go back !' And there's another lovely wailly kind of singer crying, 'Courlie, Courlie, Courlie !' Do you know his name ? And the larks are winging up and up, and everybody near is standing still a moment to find and follow their wee bodies as they soar and soar. But none among them, so they tell us, can sing like the

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

nightingale. The sparrows chatter and gossip and tell each other all the news and scandal ; the starling—ah ! he is very good at it ; he will sit on a branch for long enough singing to his lady friend, 'Pretty girl ! pretty girl ! Dear ! dear ! Come away !' And there's another poor fellow—can you guess him ?—whose wife has given him a very poor breakfast, and he can't get it off his mind ; sits all day long saying to himself over and over, 'A little bit of bread and no cheese !' But there is none of them like the nightingale. And yet, the wise men tell us, the nightingale hasn't always got its lovely voice. When he is a young thing he doesn't sing ; but only when he is mating, and when he and his wife are building the nest. It's slow work building nests, and she gets tired of it, and it's then he sings and sings his glorious songs to cheer her up. And when she is sitting on the eggs—that's very boring, days on days of it. You know, and you remember how you hated, that summer you were ill, having to lie in bed week after week ; or you know when you have a long French exercise and can hear the click of the bats outside, how sick you get of having to stick in, and how inclined you feel to chuck it up and chance a row. Well ! the nightingale gets weary like that ; and it's then that her mate sings to her, sings on and on and on. And this is a queer thing, isn't it ?—the very day the eggs are hatched, or almost so, he loses his glorious voice, he can't sing any longer, can only make a harsh, ugly, grating croak.

There is something for you to think about. It is when the nightingale is thinking, not of himself one little bit, but of somebody else, and trying to be nice to her and cheer her up and play the game, that he comes to his best and is happiest and sings just because everything is so glorious and jolly. You think that if you are to have a good time you must grab ; and if there is something splendid you cry out, 'Take me ! Me first !' That is the way to be happy you are sure, and to have a good time. But you're wrong ! The nightingale is happiest when it's not thinking of itself at all ; and if you could forget yourself, and what you want, and what you like, and would give mother a hand now and then instead of always choosing what seems better fun, and would let the little ones have a chance, not always make them do what you prefer, you would really be far happier than you are the other way. Selfishness is a mean cheat ; it takes your money and then doesn't give you what it promised,

not the real thing. It's like the fellow, who after you had saved up ever so long sent you faked stamps ; or the man who sold you a knife, and you saw at once it hadn't Sheffield on the blades, and said so, but he told you it was every bit as good ; and it won't cut at all, was far worse than your old one in a day ! Happiness is a queer thing ; if you run after it, it's like the rainbow foot, you never reach it, though it always looks as if you were quite near. But if you forget about it, and think of other people, you will find it in your hands.

Look at the nightingale, and listen to him singing as nothing else can do, and all because he has clean forgotten about himself, and is trying to make others happy.

But why ever does he stop and lose his voice ? I think perhaps it's partly his wife's fault ! You see, at the start there was just him and her, and they were very much to one another. But when the wee ones came, there were so many of them, and they were such dears, that she rather forgot about him ; or if she noticed him, was apt to scold and say, ' You haven't brought a worm for the last quarter of a minute ! Why are you idling there ? And what do you think a great hulking thing like you is for ? ' And he feels a little sad about it and stops singing. That's perhaps the way of it. And you had better think about that also. Mother, too, goes singing about the house, for she too is very happy. You are a cosy little nestful ; and she loves you, and you love her ; and it's all just as nice as nice can be. But if you were ever to forget her, she would stop singing and grow very sad. Forget about her ! you cry, and you laugh at such a silly thing. For how could anybody forget mother ? And yet other children had the nicest mother, so they thought, in all the world ; and she too played with them, and worked for them, and tucked them in at night, and came to them at once all the way up the stairs whenever there was trouble, a tumble or a broken knee or a hurt finger to be mended, and they too loved her very much. But they've gone out into the world now, and they don't seem to remember her or anything about it. How horrid of them, do you say ? It is ; and yet, how often did you write your mother when you were away ? Once ! Only once ! or not at all ! What with the cows and the hens and the car, and the splendid time you had out in the country, had you no time for her ? But that looks rather as if you too might forget about

her by and by ! And that will never do ! If I were you I would give her an extra hug to-night when she comes round, an extra long and tight one, just to let her know that you'll never forget her, never, never, never !

And then there is this last thing worth thinking over. If anything goes wrong with the nightingale's nest just after the little birds are hatched, say the first day or the next, if a cat gets at them or something terrible like that, the nightingale gets back his voice. He starts, he and his wife, making another nest, and she sits on another set of eggs, and all the time he sings and sings as gloriously as ever. But if he has lost his voice for, say, a week before that cat comes prowling, then he doesn't get it back, and doesn't build another home, goes croaking harshly all the summer. And so you see if you are drifting into any ugly thing, you had better stop at once. You are a decent little chap, as straight as straight can be. At least you used to be so, but are you just quite as honest now, or at school are you beginning to shuffle a little ? You used to be a really unselfish wee lass, but is that going ! Take you care ; you can perhaps do things like that once, or it may be twice, and stop them, but if you keep on doing them a very few times more you'll find you can't. The nightingale has lost its voice. To-day it can get it back, and probably it can still manage it to-morrow, but by the next day it can't. Take care, if you are ever going to get rid of that new, ugly thing, and be again the clean, honest, sunny little fellow that you were, then you must do it now.

Broadcasting.¹

' A good man out of the good treasure of his heart *sendeth forth* good things : and an evil man out of the evil treasure *sendeth forth* evil things.'—Mt 12³⁵.

Most people are interested in ' listening in,' and a great many, with bought sets, or home-made sets, are busy at it.

But ' broadcasting ' comes first to give us something to listen to, and that is what I want to speak about.

How many broadcasting stations are there in Great Britain ? You tell me ' six,' and perhaps you go on to tell me ' they are 5SC, 2LO, 2IT,' and so on. Well, I would like to say there are about forty-five million ! Everybody is a broadcasting station, you and I, and every one. We

¹ By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

broadcast what Jesus calls 'idle words,' that is, the words we say without thinking, the words that just spill over out of the 'abundance of the heart,' the words that come out because the heart is full of them. We are not specially thinking what we say; they come out in fun, in anger, in chatter, and we don't think where they go or who hears them.

At one station the Children's Talk was being given, and it sounded as if the speaker loved the children and his task of speaking to them, but an 'idle word' spoilt it all. He finished up, 'Good-bye, my dear boys and girls. Shut off that wretched machine!' It was overheard.

Now Jesus says, 'A good man out of the fulness of his heart broadcasts good things, and an evil man, evil things.'

Let me show some of both sorts.

Once Jesus was praying to God. He wasn't thinking of His disciples. He was just letting the fulness of His heart overflow to His Father. But the disciples heard Him; and when He finished, they came and asked Him to teach them to pray.

Paul and Silas were once in prison, in an inner cell, sore from scourging, with their feet in the stocks. They weren't thinking about the other prisoners, and they sang praises to God, and the prisoners listened. They had never heard anything like that in prison before; groans, curses, and bitter complaints they had often heard, but not praises sung to God. Can't you imagine how it would set them thinking?

The poet Browning has a beautiful poem which tells of a day in the life of a little Italian mill-girl. It was her one holiday in the year, and as she went about she sang a happy song about God, because her heart was full of joy and God. Different people heard it, and the poem tells how it comforted some who were sad, and stopped from evil some who were sinful. Pippa never knew. She just broadcasted a good thing out of a good heart; and she goes to bed wondering if her life could ever touch the lives of those others to help. She didn't know that she had done it by her idle words.

Here is the other sort. Peter is standing by a fire in the courtyard of a house denying that he is a disciple of Jesus. He gets angry, and oaths and curses pour out broadcast. Then he sees Jesus looking at him. He realizes where his words have gone, and how they have hurt, and Peter rushes out weeping bitterly.

An English king is in France, and some news is

brought to him that makes him furiously angry. Hot words burst from his lips. 'Will no one rid me of this troublesome priest?' The evil words fall on evil ears. Soon men are spurring on the road, and in a short while the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket, lies murdered in his cathedral, because King Henry broadcasted wild and angry words without thinking how far they would go and what harm they would do.

Sometimes a father checks his son for using some foolish phrase, and he gets the answer, 'I heard you saying it.'

Little boys listen to what the big boys say and copy it. Little girls listen to the big ones and do the same.

Take care what you are broadcasting. Our thoughts are our own, but after they are spoken they are out of our power to control.

'If I should *speak* thus,' says a wise old Psalmist, who was thinking very bitter things—'if I should *speak* thus, I would offend against the generation of thy children.'

If we have bitter thoughts, we must keep them to ourselves for the sake of others. It is not easy always to do it, for full hearts spill over. Therefore the best way is to ask God to keep our hearts, so that they be full of His love, and the things that are good and happy and kind. Then we will broadcast nothing that will hurt, and much that will make for happiness in this listening world, and we will not need to fear when God calls us to account for our idle words.

The Christian Year.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Ministry of Restoration.

'Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness.'—Gal 6¹.

The recurrence of inconsistency and even scandal in the life of the Christian community is a disheartening incident which always has to be reckoned with. Perhaps we blame the methods of conversion for such mishaps. We say, on the one hand, that crude revival converts, subjected to extreme momentary excitement and imperfectly instructed, are sure to fail after a while. If, on the other hand, we are in sympathy with special revival movements, we are apt to blame the quieter methods through which people are gathered into

the Church, and assume that the nature has not been agitated and radically changed. Such pleas are irrelevant on whichever side they are used, for, as a matter of fact, the breakdowns come impartially and have no discernible connexion with the methods through which men and women are brought into the Church.

And so a ministry of restoration is necessary. It does two things. It makes for the protection and nurture of the weak; it also makes for our own spiritual perfecting.

1. *The ministry of restoration is necessary for the weak.*—The word 'brethren,' which introduces the appeal, strikes the keynote of the argument, for brethren cannot be made or unmade at will. The bond between us and those with whom we have had communion in the presence of our Lord is not ended by what may prove only a temporary aberration from the best standards of Christian conduct, however grievous and exasperating the lapse may be. Whilst any residuum of the truth which saves remains in the heart and conscience of those overtaken in a fault, we must recognize the obligation growing up out of our participation in the one bread and the one blood. Christian discipleship implies incorporation into the body of which Christ Jesus is the head, and he who falls into transgression has not lost the possibility of a revived adjustment to the sacred functions of that body. Bishop Lightfoot tells us that the Greek word for 'restore' means, in its primitive etymology, to set a bone or put back into its right place a dislocated joint. Now, whilst it may sometimes be a duty to the body to cut off a part in which actual mortification has set in, the readjustment where the condition is not obviously hopeless is a duty devolving upon those who have the necessary qualifications for the task.

Whilst this task is of urgent obligation, it is also immense in its difficulties, and demands qualifications of surpassing delicacy. To treat the fallen disciple as a common sinner may be accepted as a grave offence, and call forth the rage of wounded pride. He has lost, moreover, the temper which once helped him to bear rebuke, and indeed to welcome it, whilst he was a loyal member of the believing brotherhood, seeking honestly to know himself, and to press on after the highest spiritual perfection he could conceive. He is perhaps poised between self-justification and despair. He is intent upon maintaining his self-respect; and to do

that he must blame the religion which has permitted him to fall. Harshness, unjust reproach, recrimination, any superior assumption on the part of the man who assumes the office of restorer, will do mischief rather than effect good. The Apostle singles out for the delicate and vital work of restoration those who are spiritual in temper and habit of mind, a qualification which lends itself to plain and simple tests. The spiritual man is one who, in his prevailing modes of thought and feeling, has become subdued and sensitive to the will of the all-surrounding Spirit of God. Spirituality arises not from a quality of temperament, but from a receptive habit of soul. The spiritual man is steeped in the fulness of the Divine life, and his dispositions are assimilated to those dispositions of gentle and tender helpfulness which have their home in God, and are conveyed by His Spirit to others. The Spirit puts His own impress upon the man who is designated to this Christlike work of readjustment and restoration. For to recover is in reality the work of the Divine Spirit Himself, and the Spirit seeks a spiritual man to be the instrument of it. No other qualification will avail for the great enterprise. If we would take part in the enterprise, we must cultivate spirituality—for spirituality is fitness.

2. *The ministry of restoration is necessary for our own spiritual perfecting, and only those who are spiritually minded can undertake it.*—The recovery of others is a motive to spirituality, and we shall be confirmed in the rarest attainments of the religious life by the work for which we fit ourselves. The Church is unspiritual where this work is undone, or pursued with but indifferent success. Moreover, strong motives are necessary to sustain a man in the task of recovering the fallen to their lost purity of faith and life, and such motives are found only amongst those who are deeply spiritual. These perceive what a tragedy it is for a man to lose his place in the spiritual order and to disappear from the providential sphere where such possibilities were within his reach.

Meekness is allied to spirituality, and there can be no effectual ministry to those who are estranged where there is a temper of wrath, pride, and spiritual superciliousness. The task must be begun, continued, and ended in the spirit of lowliness. The spiritual man is always humble, for he has learned his dependence on those inspirations which come down from God. It is his own sense of nothingness

which enables him to receive the subtle influences by which he is transformed and spiritualized. 'Considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.'

The highest spirituality is altruistic, for its genius constrains it to sympathy with those who fall, and a tireless endeavour to lift them up. That Church is not the most Christlike which is careful of its reputation and has an immaculate record, but the Church which risks even its own name in stretching out hands to the weak, and within which the spiritual find time and faculties absorbed in bringing back those who have gone astray. The genius of spirituality is practical. The function of the man who is possessed by the Divine Spirit and inspired with the Divine breath is to restore those who have been overtaken in offence and transgression.¹

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Blessing.

'The good will of him that dwelt in the bush.'—Dt 33¹⁶.

This is part of the blessing with which Moses blessed the children of Israel. He had brought them out of Egypt through the great and terrible wilderness to the borders of the Promised Land. In a few days they were to pass into the land, and take possession of it. But Moses himself was not to go with them; and so, before they parted, he bestowed his blessing upon them.

He blessed each of the tribes separately, calling them by the names of their ancestors, the sons of Jacob. These sons of Jacob had stamped their character upon their descendants, and Moses, who knew them so well, knew that God would work out His purposes in each case according to the lines of that character.

The finest of all the blessings is that pronounced upon the tribe of Joseph. For if the tribe of Joseph possessed the character of Joseph himself, and if their destiny was to be in accordance with it, they were fortunate indeed. If David is spoken of as the man after God's own heart, we might perhaps speak of Joseph as the man after man's own heart. Moses seems to have felt that. At any rate, it is a wonderfully beautiful blessing—that blessing with which he blessed the tribe of Joseph. It is full of beautiful phrases—'fruits brought forth

by the sun,' 'the precious things of the earth and the fulness thereof,' and then it ends up most unexpectedly with 'the good will of him that dwelt in the bush.'

The old man's memory suddenly went back forty years. One event in his life stood out beyond all others—the event that called him to his life's work. One day in the wilderness he was arrested by the sight of a bush burning and not being consumed. And out of the midst of the bush a voice spoke to him. That voice was the voice of God, and the God who spoke to him in the bush had been with him throughout his whole life since that day. And now he had reached the end of the course. He had fought a good fight and finished the course. He had been tested by prosperity in Egypt and adversity in the wilderness, but through it all he had stood firm. This God had been his comfort and strength.

On that day on which he looked with amazement at a bush burning and not consumed, a new thing entered into his life which made all the difference to him. His spirit awoke that day to the knowledge of another Spirit. His will surrendered that day to a stronger Will. He became servant that day to a new Master—a Master who paid him with sufferings and trials without number, but whom nevertheless he had found it a delight to serve. And now, looking back over the forty years he had served Him, he feels that the best blessing he can bestow on any one is just this—'the good will of him that dwelt in the bush.'

What kind of a God was He?

1. For one thing, *He was tender and sympathetic.* His words to Moses were: 'I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows.' That is a God whose good will is worth having. It is a strange thing that, although God was spoken of in that way at the very beginning of their history, the Israelites never thought much of the sympathy of God and never had any real understanding of what it meant until Christ came. But when Christ came, that was the revelation above all others that He brought with Him. That was the very reason why Christ came into the world—because God had seen our afflictions and knew our sorrows. It was a tender, sympathetic God who had been with Moses all these forty years. We find just the same God in Jesus Christ. Have we realized how sympathetic

¹ T. G. Selby, *The Commonwealth of the Redeemed*, 154.

He is? The writers of the New Testament try ever so many ways to make us understand it. They speak of Him as having a fellow-feeling for our infirmities, and as having been tempted in all points like as we are. When the crowds came to listen to His preaching, Jesus thought of them as sheep without a shepherd and worried by dogs. And again and again we read that He had compassion on the multitude.

2. But there is another thing to notice about this God that dwelt in the bush. He is *a God that gives a man great tasks to do in life*. 'Come now,' He said to Moses, 'and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt.'

We are sometimes told to be satisfied with little things in life. There is a verse of one of our hymns which says :

The trivial round, the common task,
Will furnish all we ought to ask,
Room to deny ourselves, a road
To bring us daily nearer God.

There is a great truth expressed in that hymn—the truth that we may serve God well in carrying out faithfully the most ordinary duties of life. But there is a danger all the same of misapplying that thought. We are not to make it an excuse for remaining content with the common and easy duty if God calls us to an uncommon and difficult one. And He may call us more often than we think. The truth is, we do not want to be called to difficult tasks, and so we do not hear God's call when it comes. Moses would a thousand times rather have gone on keeping the flock of his father-in-law all his life long than have accepted God's call to go down into Egypt to deliver the Israelites. Let us look for the call of God in our own lives and let us take up the task He offers us, however hard it may seem.

3. For there is a third thing to be said about this God that dwelt in the bush: *If He calls you to a hard task He gives you strength for it*. He sends no man a-warring on his own charges. He promises 'as thy days so shall thy strength be.' More than that, He works along with us, giving us strength for the task by going with us to the discharge of it. Moses hesitated, as he well might, but God said, 'Surely I will be with thee.' That made all the difference. Moses had some idea of the difficulty of the work that lay before him, but its difficulty was far greater than he had any conception of. He had difficulty in

persuading the Israelites to let him go to Pharaoh and ask for their deliverance. He had far more difficulty in persuading Pharaoh to let them go. But none of these difficulties was to be compared with the difficulty of leading them through the wilderness. We may say quite safely that but for God's presence with him he could not possibly have done it. And we must not think that men are different now from what they were then, or that God is different. If He puts us in some trying position or calls us to undertake some arduous work, He will be with us and carry us through. Remember Moses, who endured as seeing Him who is invisible. But certainly his life is worth remembering as that of a man who used all the powers that God had given him. And at the end of his life he could speak of this God as one whose good will was the highest blessing that any man could have.

Is not this true of our Lord yet? Whom has He failed? When has He broken His word? Who can say that he has gone to Him for strength and has not received it? Have we known any higher blessing than this of Moses—'the good will of him that dwelt in the bush'?

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Excellence of the Commonplace.

'But Naaman was wroth, and went away, and said, Behold, I thought, He will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and wave his hand over the place, and recover the leper. Are not Abanah and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? may I not wash in them, and be clean?' So he turned, and went away in a rage.—2 K 5^{11, 12}.

The irritation of Naaman is so natural that it hardly requires any words of explanation. We recognize in a moment what vexed him so, just because we have often been so vexed ourselves. Naaman expected a striking and startling cure. He knew how the Syrian magicians would conduct themselves. They would come forth in procession, muttering their incantations, and moving their hands in mysterious fashion over the sufferer. Something of this kind, no doubt, Naaman was expecting when he rode up in state to Elisha's door. Then came Elisha's message, 'Go and wash in Jordan.' Go and do something that any man could do. And it was all so commonplace—so ordinary—so utterly lacking in dramatic interest, that Naaman was intensely irritated.

1. Naaman was not alone in his irritation, for *the dislike of the commonplace is well-nigh universal.*

There is another Bible story where the same intense dislike makes itself manifest. 'Is not this the carpenter's son? Do we not know His brothers?' It was with such words that the Jews discredited Jesus. They were intensely irritated at the commonplaceness of this Messiah's advent. It was a prevalent belief of the Jews that the second Adam would come in full-grown manhood like the first. They had the convenient habit, which we all possess, of forgetting the prophecies they wanted to forget. Suddenly, in some epiphany of glory, perhaps from the secret of the Temple, Christ would appear. Then Christ was born in a little hillside village, and He was rocked in His cradle by His village mother, and He wrought with His father who was the village carpenter, and He played with His comrades in the village streets—and it was all so commonplace to unobservant eyes—so untouched with a single gleam of scenic splendour, that the Jews, like Naaman, were very angry, and went away from Christ Jesus in a rage.

But to come nearer home and think of ourselves—are we not all prone to the same irritation? Think, for example, of how we regard our newspapers. A man takes up his paper with a feeling of expectancy; he rarely lays it down without some disappointment. We say, There is nothing in the newspaper this morning—nothing—and so we throw it down. What we really mean is that there is nothing startling, nothing to thrill and hold us by its tragedy.

Is that faint vexation not akin to Naaman's when he was bidden by Elisha to go and wash in Jordan? Does it not indicate that it is very hard to realize the value of the ordinary? The fact is we are half-savage at the heart yet, and have never lost the savage delight in glaring colours.

Much, too, of the disappointment that unfolding life brings with it is connected by very real yet subtle ties with this deep-seated vexation at the commonplace. When we are young we all dream heroic dreams. We start from childhood, as Naaman did from Syria, not knowing anything, but seeing glorious visions; and we have all pictured in our schoolboy years what is going to happen when we meet Elisha. Then we, too, come to the borders of our manhood and our womanhood—we approach the threshold we have so often dreamed of in those days of the heroes when we were

little children; but the pageantry we looked for and the glory we foresaw do not meet us any more than they met Naaman: like Naaman we are just bidden go and wash in Jordan. Our joys have nothing remarkable about them—they are just the joys of a thousand other homes. There is nothing spectacular about our sorrows—we can point to a score of hearts which have been torn like ours. We are not such geniuses as we once thought we were—matched with the great world we come to find our level—life is more ordinary, and far more commonplace, than we ever dreamed of in the golden morning. So springs one disappointment of maturity; so springs the temptation to innumerable sins. It almost seems as if the promise of life had cheated us—life has evolved so differently from our expectation. How many men turn away in a rage from life's plain duties not because they are difficult, but because they are dull!¹

2. *The dislike of the commonplace is dangerous.* It is dangerous first because the commonplace is the warp and woof of life. No inspired moments may have flashed out of a blue eternity into our soul to fire it to dazzling deeds that challenge the world's attention; deeds upon which we can look back with a perennial satisfaction that says: 'My soul, because of that bright exploit, thou hast not lived in vain!' There may have been in our experience no 'Crowded hour of glorious life' to make us feel that it is worth while to endure the plodding round for the sake of the occasional intoxication of soul that kindles the imagination and sets the pulse a-beating to the tune of a glad triumphal march; or to persuade us that, though our canopy be clouds, yet it is good to walk beneath them for hope of the golden brilliancy that will, ever and anon, stream through the murky mist and flood the world around us. We have not known these experiences, and may not expect to know them; a myriad million paltrinesses, a multitude of trivialities which no man can number, overtaking us with the dull mechanic regularity of clockwork, have commandeered our life, and spread it over with their drab monotony. Nevertheless, although

To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time,

yet shall our faith prevail, nourishing itself upon the knowledge that our times are in the Father's

¹ G. H. Morrison, *The Unlighted Lustre*, 52.

hand, and that one day, He, in His marvellously tender skill, will gather up the loose threads of our purposes and the broken ends of our achievement and make them warp and woof of a luminous eternity.

A hope like that is an inspiration, but it must not be used as an opiate. There are monotonies in the lives of others for which it is our business to find a remedy. There are samenesses in our own lives where we must see not sameness but variety. He who says that the million blades of grass are all the same has surely never seen two blades of grass together; for the significant truth is that there are not two of them the same. With similar minuteness of unparalleled workmanship, the loving hand of the Ever-blessed has scattered His ministries of comfort, of joy, of beauty, of laughter, of faith, of hope, of love, over the stale monotonies of life, that whosoever will may behold and find them.

Goethe has pointed out in *Poetry and Truth* that all our comfort hinges upon the unfailing recurrence of the most ordinary phenomena, such as light and darkness, the flowers, the fruits, the seasons; and that it is only when we withdraw our natural interest from these that we begin to loathe our very existence and to find our days a burden.

The dislike of the commonplace is dangerous, in the second place, not only because it is the lot of most of us, but because it affords us our greatest opportunity.

'I remember,' says Mr. Graham,¹ 'having once, in the hearing of a farmer, expressed pity for the horses that were ploughing in a steep field. "Surely," I remarked, "if they have much of that to do, it will soon wear them out." "Oh no!" was his reply, "the horses that plough on the level wear out sooner than those that are put to the hilly lands; you see they are always using the same set of muscles." The easier job was the more trying work: it was a severer test of the animal. Perhaps in that may be found the explanation why the flats and fens of human life are such an ordeal; they keep the burden, as it were, upon the same set of spiritual muscles continually.'

It is not strange that when great occasions arise the man to fit the occasion should so frequently arrive along with it, as if by magic. It must be so: for it is less difficult to fit a great occasion than a small one, and more people can do it.

'The highest form of martyrdom,' as Mark

Rutherford so wisely says, 'is not dying for a cause, it is not even living for the sake of a cause; but living without one, merely because it is your duty to live. If you are called upon to testify to a great truth it is easy to sing in flames. . . . The saints whom I would canonise are not martyrs to a cause, but those who have none.'

There is a song, familiar to us all, in which these lines occur:

'You'll tak' the high road, an' I'll tak' the low road,
And I'll be in Scotland afore ye.'

Now, some say that these words are an allegory, and that they speak of the 'Land o' the Leal.' If that be so, then they speak God's truth. For the low road to heaven, the road that runs through the valley of humiliation and the plains of penitence and the wilderness of trivial occupation, is a shorter and a surer way to that blessed land than the high road of ambitious and uncertain service.²

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Reward of Well-doing.

'And David said, Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may shew him kindness for Jonathan's sake?'—2 S 9¹.

The part that Samuel the prophet played after a point in Saul's career—not uniformly either a wise or a just part—was enough to convince Jonathan that, whether the prophet spoke by the mouth of the Lord or only by his own, his partisan zeal in the interests of David had made his father's cause impossible. But should we wonder if Jonathan had made a determined stand for his own personal rights and the fortunes of his house? Out of a notable and almost matchless friendship he took the opposite course, and held himself ready to decrease, that the man who had taken his place might increase.

Because of his devotion to his rival he made his position intolerable at the court of his father the king, and after a bitterly chequered experience, while as yet the sun of his years was at its meridian, he fell on Gilboa, bravely doing his duty in what he knew was a lost cause. Whether or not he recognized a higher will in the fortunes of David, there is nothing in history more worthy to receive the homage of all time than the part which this man played in this ancient drama of a friendship which was without variableness or shadow of turning.

¹ J. K. Graham, *Anno Domini*, 156.

² *Ibid.* 160.

‘And David said, Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may shew him kindness for Jonathan’s sake?’ We are glad to read this. Without question David was a man of fine spiritual perception, and he had a deep religious nature; but, even allowing for his day and his position, he had the defects of his qualities in a very pronounced form. We are the better, therefore, for knowing of his gratitude for a friendship which gave all for nothing, and that he showed it through one whom he could easily have overlooked.

This is the explanation of Mephibosheth at the royal table. This is the meaning of that rapid transition from Lo-debar to kings’ houses. There had been a father who had not always looked to his own things, who had lived above, and away from, miserable aims that began and ended with himself. And because he had done good, hoping for nothing in return, among other things his afflicted, helpless, lonely son had come so far nearer to his own. ‘Cast thy bread upon the waters, and thou shalt find it after many days.’ ‘Give a portion to seven, also to eight, for thou knowest not what shall come after thee on the earth.’

With this incident in mind, let us take three things for consideration.

1. *The reward of doing good.*—Many people doubt, or they affect to doubt, whether there is such a thing in our human relations one to another as disinterested goodness; or if there be, which is hard to believe, to expect gratitude in return for doing good is to reveal ourselves either as very simple people or as decidedly too good for a world like this, with such natures as ours. Whatever may be said about rewards, it is a fact that the blessings of the Bible are always poured on right-doing. In the Beatitudes of Jesus there is not a single blessing pronounced on merely social pre-eminence and influence. Someone has very truly remarked that all the persons referred to in these golden sayings might be extinguished to-morrow, and the world of social importance would not, on the side of its importance, be conscious of any loss. And there is gratitude. How little we know about the source of our own riches! Some of us may be, many of us are, reaping to-day harvests which our fathers sowed in fields which seemed to promise so little of the fruits of gratitude. ‘Years ago,’ says Dr. Ambrose Shepherd,¹ ‘a youth applied for a place in one of the great ironworks in the north of

England. To his surprise, he received almost by return of post a kind note from the head of the firm asking him to call at his private residence. “Your father,” said the gentleman to the lad when he called, “was ever too busy helping others to do much for himself. I cannot say how much I owe to the start he gave me, and to his counsel in the earlier stages of my business career; and for his sake it now depends upon yourself to what you will rise with us.” ‘Give, and it shall be given you.’ This is no impersonal word, said of some impersonal force. Jesus has taught us that God is our Father, and we rob the name of its meaning when we think of Him as so fettered by what we are pleased to call ‘the general laws of His administration’ as to be unable to keep His word and fulfil His promises. We must give to get; and no man does an unselfish thing and fails of the reward there is in the thing itself. ‘Give, and it shall be given you.’ The promise may be fulfilled in the reflex influence of unselfishness, in what has been finely called, ‘the joy of doing good’ or it may come back to us in kind, either in our outward fortunes or to some one closely bound up with our life.

2. *There is a good that is greater than reward.*—We have to admit that we do not always come to our own in this matter of gratitude. The Gospel lesson for to-day is the cleansing of the ten lepers. And it was after that cleansing that our Lord said, ‘Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine?’ Need we marvel if the experience of the servant in the matter of thanks is not very different from that of his Lord? Ingratitude is such a common fault. It is always breaking hearts. And yet it was for the men’s sakes, because of what it augured in them, that the look of sadness spread over the Saviour’s face, and He said, ‘Where are the nine?’

In our work for others we must learn to do without gratitude. We do not know the secret of service until we have learned to do without it. It is to doing good we are called, not to thanks for doing it. And we are of no real use to God or man until, if not the joy, yet the imperatives of service swallow up the pain of the self-sacrifice we make, and convert our dependence upon thanks into the springs of a higher satisfaction.

3. *There is a good that is independent of reward.*—To do good hoping for nothing in return is not to say there is no return. What return can be more or greater than this: ‘That ye may be the children

¹ Ambrose Shepherd, *Sermons*, 128.

of your Father which is in heaven'? 'God Almighty knows His mind about me,' said David Livingstone, 'and I am not going to trouble about that. His will is final, and good as it is final; and it is my business to find out by obedience what that mind is, and make it my own.' We should be less concerned to know that God is on our side. It is enough if we can be sure that we are on the side of God. Do not let us ask that our work should seem as well as be. Let us but have a good conscience over it, and be content even to see it fail—knowing that that is part of God's way of making it succeed.

Whosoever takes God's side, in so far as he works loyally for God, in so far as he works steadfastly without impatience for premature results, in so far as he works joyously in the liberty of the Spirit and not as the slave of his toil, for him victory in all things is set fast and secure. If we are saved ourselves, we are saved to serve; and nothing will prevail with men to-day but the love of an unselfish service, for that in us is the love of Christ which constraineth. We may not see the result to-day, nor yet to-morrow; but we shall see that it was every day and all the way as we look back upon it out of the white radiance of eternity.¹

Cast your bread upon the waters, far and wide
your treasure strew;
Scatter it with willing fingers, shout for joy to
see it go;
You may think it lost for ever; but, as sure as
God is true,
In this life, and in the other, it will yet return to
you.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Neutrality.

'He that is not with me is against me.'—Mt 12³⁰.

Our Lord stood almost alone against all the religious, learned, and ruling classes of His nation; but, though standing thus alone, He made the tremendous claim: 'He that is not with me is against me.' In completest contrast with these words stands the claim of Socrates, the wisest of all the Greeks. Far from declaring himself the possessor of any final or even partial form of wisdom, he maintained that the point in which he excelled all other teachers was just this, that in the field of truth he knew his own ignorance and was conscious

of his own limitations. And yet this young Prophet of Galilee, who never wrote a book, who taught only for three years, and by His teaching and life alienated the so-called wise and learned men of His own nation, who won only a few converts, and finally died a malefactor's death, used no words of idle assumption when He said: 'He that is not with me is against me.' History has shown in unmistakable terms the truth of these words. His life and teaching, as they reach ever wider and wider circles down the ages, have been steadily forcing individuals and nations alike to take thought and to take sides either for or against Him.

All that met Christ unconsciously fell into one of three classes. The first was composed of those that accepted and loved Him; the second, of those that rejected and hated Him; and the third, of those that neither loved nor hated Him, but took up an attitude of neutrality or indifference towards Him.

Such a division is at first sight an obvious and apparently a justifiable one, but is it a true one? Are there really three classes? When man is brought face to face with such claims, Christ declares that it is not. 'He that is not with me is against me,' He said.

1. The classes of His own day took sides. The record of Christ's short ministry of three years is at the same time a record of the growing hostility of His countrymen against Him. The priestly and learned classes early took sides against Him. This hostility was due to the radical antagonism existing between their character and teaching, and those of our Lord. Their character we know. Their teaching was essentially dogmatic. Christ, on the other hand, appealed to the conscience of His hearers and never required a blind acceptance of His words.

On the defection of the ruling and learned classes, there still remained the masses (especially in Galilee) that were attracted by His teaching. Amongst these there were two types easy to distinguish. The first was represented by the peasants of Galilee. These Galilean peasants were intensely patriotic; they were full of national prejudices, but were on the whole moral and religious, and formed the best and soundest part of the nation. They cherished ardent expectations of the Messiah, and accordingly welcomed the young Prophet with the wildest enthusiasm. At last they sought by force to make Him their king. Now, had our Lord lent Himself

¹ Ambrose Shepherd, *Sermons*, 124.

to their Messianic aspirations, He could easily have made Himself the master of all Palestine. But He refused to do so.

With a word He could have won the masses to His side. But He would not speak that word. And when, notwithstanding His refusal to become their king, some of the same multitudes still followed Him, He turned and set forth His claims in such severe terms that they forsook Him forthwith, and only a bewildered few still clung fast to their allegiance.

But Christ drew faithful disciples not only from the sturdy peasant class of Galilee. He found them also amongst the publicans and sinners—classes that philosophers had regarded as hopeless, and popular opinion had branded with infamy, and by its merciless attitude had hardened into a temper of callousness and despair. By His wondrous sympathy and His faith in the goodness still latent within them, He lifted them out of their despair and sin, and quickened them with the power of a new life. Here also sides were taken for and against Him in all those who came under His immediate influence.

2. This necessity of taking sides for or against Christ becomes still more inevitable where individuals and not classes are dealt with in the Gospels. There we find every man put to the test at his weakest point, and not a single jot of Christ's exclusive claim to supremacy is toned down or forgone, whoever the individual may be. Christ wants no disciple who has not counted the cost. Every one is tried exactly where, owing to his character, he is sure to feel Christ's service a hardship, exactly where sin is most attractive and conscience is most asleep. To the man who is adjourning the day of decision to a more convenient season, He says: 'Let the dead bury their dead, but come thou, follow me'; to the man who is covetous, and whose chief desire is set on riches: 'Sell all that thou hast, and come, follow me'; to the impure man: 'Whoso looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery already with her in his heart'; to the unforgiving: 'If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you'; to the proud and self-satisfied: 'Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven'; to the mass of commonplace folk belonging to all classes, who study first, and chiefly and always, their own interest and their

own ease, but cloak their selfishness under the fashionable respectabilities of the day, He declares: 'Whosoever saveth his life—taketh the line of least resistance or any other form of self-indulgence or self-satisfaction—the same shall lose it.'

3. Is neutrality possible to-day? We all know that it is a matter of complete indifference to most of us whether certain laws of science are facts or not. Unless it is our specific duty to study these laws, we can adopt an attitude of absolute neutrality towards such conclusions of science as Einstein's doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, or the theory of the Röntgen rays, and a hundred others, and be not one whit the better or one whit the worse by adopting such a neutral attitude.

But in regard to the claims of the moral and spiritual worlds, neutrality is impossible. And why? Just because these claims bear directly on and shape our conduct, whether we will or no, for good or evil. Hence, if they are true, they are of vital importance, and if we adopt a neutral attitude towards them, such neutrality amounts to a rejection of them; for we cannot stand still, morally or spiritually. If we are neutral, we are drifting, and drifting inevitably towards an attitude of indifference and spiritual death, or of active opposition. Professor James rightly maintains this very truth in his interesting work, *The Will to Believe*.

With the exception of a minority, that constitutionally are mentally or morally incapable or have made themselves such, all men are fitted to judge between the claims of right and wrong in some degree; and, when confronted with two alternative courses of conduct, to decide which is the higher and which the lower. But, not only are men fitted to decide for or against a certain line of action, they are bound by the essential nature of the spiritual and moral laws to come to a decision. For belief and doubt affect our conduct and affect it vitally, and herein enters the claim of Christ: 'He that is not with me is against me.' Hence if in such a case a man should say: I will adopt an attitude of neutrality, or I will come to a decision at a more convenient season, such a man by so doing has already decided against the moral or religious claim at issue.

James defines the religious man as one who believes 'in the existence of some kind of an unseen order in which the riddles of the natural order may be found explained.' He maintains

that the will to believe helps to create the facts, a result which is unattainable without such belief. Hence we should approach the claims of religion with the will to believe.

It is quite true, as we know from our everyday experience, that faith in a fact does help to create the fact. By trusting in another man's good faith, we may beget that very virtue in him. By owning that we are responsible beings and acting accordingly, we become more conscientious. Thus faith in a fact helps to create the fact, but—only so far as the fact is dependent on our own personal action. James, by omitting this limitation, seems in his essay to imply that our faith in the unseen world without us does in some way create this unseen world. But the will to believe cannot create that which was in existence before the act of belief, and is, and will be in existence after it, whether we will to believe or no.

And yet in respect of this spiritual world, the will to believe can render invaluable service. It cannot create that world, but it can create evidence attesting the reality of that world, and day by day can contribute fresh evidence. Faith in God finds its own verification through the influence it exerts on life and character.

The practical results of a belief provide evidence by which its truth or falsehood may be tested. By

its fruits ye shall know of what character it is. Thus, though the will to believe cannot create truth that is independent of us, it can create evidence of truth that did not before exist. Hence St. Paul writes to his disciples, 'Ye are our epistles'—that is, epistles of the Lord—'known and read of all men.'

So we cannot halt between two opinions of vital importance. If the ever-accumulating evidence of Christian lives attests the reality of the spiritual world, then neutrality is impossible and wrong; for it amounts to a decision against the claims of Christ. There are thus no neutrals in this never-ending strife between Christ and the claims of the material life. Instinctively or deliberately, here, there, and everywhere, the consciences of men are enrolling themselves and cannot help enrolling themselves on this side or on that. It is the inevitable law of this struggle that not a single, solitary soul escapes this moral and spiritual conscription, and such is the greatness of this strife that the whole universe is divided into two camps—for Christ or against Him—and even the most distant stars fight, and must fight, in their courses against those that reject Him. 'He that is not with me is against me.'¹

¹ R. H. Charles, *The Adventure into the Unknown*, 272.

God's Purpose as Revealed in Jesus Christ.

A PRELIMINARY QUESTION.

BY THE REVEREND ALFRED E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

THE criticism of Harnack's *What is Christianity?* in Loisy's *The Gospel and the Church* has not only the immediate historical interest of presenting the contrast between Protestant Liberalism and Roman Catholic Modernism; it raises a more general and permanent issue: Is the distance, in time and space, with all the differences which this distance may involve, so great that Christ's mode of apprehending reality, intellectually, morally, and religiously cannot be ours, and must we acquiesce in an evolution which leaves little, if any, resemblance between His Christianity and ours? Would we not be at home at all in the

presence of the historical Jesus? Would He Himself feel an exile among the best Christians of to-day? The dogmatic interpretation of the Scriptures erred in treating the Bible as a placeless and dateless communication of Divine truth; and we do not need to-day to be warned of, or guarded against, the errors and failures of that interpretation. Is not the danger of what claims to be the *historical* method that for it the temporal and local form hides a permanent and universal content which each age and each land can still apprehend? If we misrepresent Jesus in thinking Him as like ourselves, do we not also miss His meaning and

worth for us when we see only how unlike He is to ourselves? There is in some critical writings an *antiquarianism* that narrows the range of the thought and life of the past, and a *modernism* that mistakes some of the tendencies of to-day for the whole movement of the age. If Harnack erred in representing Jesus as a Liberal Protestant theologian of the nineteenth century, Loisy surely erred even more in thinking of Him only as a Jewish visionary and enthusiast. Granted that eschatologically Jesus did not think as the commentary of history on prophecy and apocalypse has taught us to think, did He think so differently from us ethically and theologically that we cannot find a common moral and religious standpoint from which we can understand His hope? I am confident that we can; and this essay is an attempt to understand what the mind of Jesus as regards future destiny can mean for us to-day.

I.

We must *first of all* recognize the fact that the Apostolic Church was dominated by the expectation of the speedy Advent of Christ in power and glory. Had there been nothing in the teaching of Jesus to awaken that hope, it would be difficult to find an explanation of that fact, as the Christian community would not be likely to accept the Jewish Apocalyptic literature, and make Christ Himself the centre of expectation, unless He had given some warrant for such an outlook. But granted the warrant, it is easy to understand how under the influence of that literature the hope would develop in detailed expectations, not found in the teaching of Jesus, and then without any dishonest intent would affect the transmission of that teaching. It is very probable that the Evangelists have given greater definiteness to the eschatology of Jesus than it originally possessed.

Secondly, we must recognize that much of the terminology was traditional, derived from the prophetic and apocalyptic writings; and Jesus used it, not with prosaic literalness, but as the prophets and apocalyptists had used it, as figurative and symbolical. Surely, with the parables before us, we cannot assume that Jesus meant that what He said should be taken *verbatim et literatim*. It is moral and spiritual reality He is presenting under cover of all this imagery.

Thirdly, as to the prophets of old, there were present to His mind the immediate and the ultimate

future. He had the certain conviction that His rejection by the Jewish people meant, and could only mean, its doom. That He anticipated the destruction of Jerusalem as God's judgment is a conclusion which cannot be avoided. Surely His distress in death was partly at least due to this, that He knew that it involved such a disaster to the city, which He had striven to bring to penitence. It is to this He is surely referring when He limits the fulfilment of His predictions to this generation. As His rejection by the Jewish people involved this condemnation, the fulfilment of that judgment would be His vindication by God. Just as the prophets of old saw just behind the immediate future of God's judgment or deliverance the ultimate future of God's final fulfilment of His purpose, so would Jesus connect His manifestation in power and glory with that judgment on His foes. But He is not so confident of the second as of the first event in respect of time at least. It is surely to His Second Advent He is referring when He disclaims the knowledge He might have been expected to possess of that day and that hour. If the incarnation did involve a limitation of knowledge, if the consciousness of Jesus in regard to the future had the same characteristics as the consciousness of the prophets, it is in no way derogatory to His authority as moral and religious teacher to recognize that He set forth His hope of vindication and triumph in figurative, symbolic language, in poetry, and not prose, and that for Him as for the prophets of old, the action of God in human history was so certain and adequate that He did not realize the long and slow process in time between the immediate future which He so confidently dated, and the ultimate future of the time of which He so humbly confessed His ignorance.

Fourthly, there are parables of the Kingdom, e.g. the mustard-seed, the leaven, etc., which recognize the historical process, the activities of men which are involved in the fulfilment of the purpose of God. His teachings about God as Father, and man as child, of God's forgiveness and favour, and man's penitence and faith, of the better righteousness than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, of the greatest commandment of all, love shown in forgiving wrong, and ministering unto need even unto sacrifice, show that His outlook was wider than the eschatological school would have us believe. For it is not at all probable that the Christian Church, dominated as it was by the apocalyptic expectations,

added such religious and moral teaching. A moral and religious genius, to use the lowest term, is necessary to account for so harmonious a message ; it cannot be explained by a composite authorship. This teaching is so congruous to the personality of Jesus as presented in the Gospels that thought and life confirm each other. Had the core of His message been a prediction which was not fulfilled, had that prediction not been quite a subordinate element, then undoubtedly He would have appeared as a visionary, and His authority in religion and morals would be by so much depreciated ; but a sound literary and historical criticism does not justify such an assumption.

Fifthly, if this theological and ethical teaching is authentic, then the eschatological must be interpreted in the light of it. Even if He emphasized the activity of God in human history as we do not habitually, unless we have learned to think as He thought, He did not ignore that God's action is *conditioned*, limited, and delayed by man's. He summoned men to repentance and faith, and believed that God's grace was restrained by disobedience and unbelief. This consideration has force added to it, if we accept the theory, which I must regard as inadequate in view of all the data, that Jesus submitted to death in the hope that that death might accomplish what His life had failed to do, to bring about such a change in the attitude of men as would make the full coming of the Kingdom possible. He did not conceive of His second advent as merely a supernatural event brought about by the Divine omnipotence. For if, as we are entitled to assume, He believed that the Kingdom had come in promise and potency in Himself, and that the historical process by which it should fully come had already begun, He could not have thought of the consummation as in character incongruous with its commencement and its course. That Jesus thought of that consummation as God's act we cannot doubt ; that He thought of it as an act unconditioned by man's actions we have no reason to believe ; that His confidence in God's sufficiency on the one hand, and His inability on the other hand to realize how much man's sin and unbelief could hinder and delay God's action, led Him to anticipate a speedier consummation than the event has proved, is the best explanation we can offer of the, to our minds, seeming inconsistency of His faith in the present and His hope for the future of the one Kingdom.

II.

These considerations, which a study of the New Testament without the modernist assumptions justifies, lead us to a conclusion from which our further discussion may make a start.

Firstly, Jesus was not so apocalyptic, supernaturalist, catastrophic in His outlook as the modernists make Him out to be ; He was not so remote from the way in which a modern man may think. He was more theological and ethical in His teaching than the modernists allow ; and here the modern man may find himself on common ground. What is there in the brief summary of the teaching of Jesus which has been given in a preceding paragraph, that we cannot accept to-day with a clear reason and a clean conscience ? If a difference remains, is it altogether to the advantage of the modern man, and the depreciation of the truth and wisdom of Jesus ?

Secondly, there is a difference between the outlook of Jesus and the assumption of modernism ; and I am confident that the Christian Church must choose between them ; and if it is to live, grow, and endure, it must prefer the truth and wisdom of Christ to much of the thought of to-day. While in the controversy between Harnack and Loisy, I find myself in more general agreement with the former, yet Loisy does emphasize an element in the teaching of Christ which Harnack virtually ignores. The preceding discussion has been directed mainly against Loisy's exaggeration of this apocalyptic element ; now we must seek to correct the error of Harnack's neglect of it.

Thirdly, the danger of the modern mind is to think that Evolution is a substitute for Creation, that God's activity must be limited by Nature as it is known to science, and that there can be no action of God in and through nature, which is not so explicable ; that the human process in history is self-enclosed, and self-sufficient ; and that God is only a spectator of and not an actor in the world drama. The crude conceptions of a supernaturalism which gloried in the shame of making faith appear as unreasonable as could be, *e.g.* that miracles are contrary to Nature, a violation of natural laws, that God intervenes in, and interferes with, the course of Nature, we must certainly abandon. Nature is not alien to God, so that He shows Himself God by suspending its operations, and disregarding its laws ; this is a prejudiced belief, and not a

reasonable faith. For faith God is in all, and through all ; in the physical forces there is a finite exercise of His infinite will ; in the natural laws there is a finite expression of His infinite wisdom. The uniformity of nature is a token of the constancy of His purpose, and His fidelity to His promises. We should be plunged into mental confusion, and physical disaster, if God acted as capriciously in Nature as this supernaturalism represented Him as doing. But on the other hand to ignore God's activity, to limit God by Nature and man, to lay all the stress on the human process in history, to rely on man's resources and to neglect the resources in God which faith can reach, to summon men to work out their salvation without giving them the encouragement that it is God that worketh in them, is to challenge all religion as an illusion and a deception.

Fourthly, over against all such tendencies stands Jesus Christ, the author and finisher of faith, who proves all that faith can do in making God real, active, potent, dominant in the life of man. God was so real to Him that He always and everywhere found God ; in Nature and History the Heavenly Father had worked hitherto, and He was working with and as God. God can direct the course of human history because He can influence the thoughts and lives of men ; if there were only more faith in God, more confidence in His sufficiency, more submission to His authority, God could and would do greater things for men by men. The historical process, in which His purpose is being fulfilled, could be speeded beyond men's brightest hopes if faith were more confident and courageous. As Jesus did not find in Himself those hindrances of faith which so abound in other men, He expected great things from God as He attempted great things for God ; and He expected men to share both His hopes and efforts.

Fifthly, the attention which is being now given

to the teaching of Jesus regarding human duty is all to the good ; but the promise this movement holds will be disappointed, if the fulfilment of human duty is regarded as itself sufficient, and the faith that relies on the resources of God is left out of account. There is no need to acquiesce, as many do, in the assumption that the process must be slow, since men move slowly in religion and morals. God can and will by His own Spirit speed the process, if only men are willing to suffer Him to be their sufficiency. It was not only that Christ had this confidence in what God could and would do ; Paul, to whom to live was Christ, knew himself more than a conqueror, able to do all things through Him who strengthened Him. God's omnipotence will not, and in this moral and spiritual progress cannot override man's activities, since here men are and must be fellow-workers with God, and it is their development unto perfection which is the end. But the aspiration and the effort which are sustained by faith in God's will and power to fulfil His purpose in and with men will command more Divine resources, and cannot therefore measure the promise of the future by the possibilities of man alone. Two convictions the Christian mind to-day, if it is not to be misled by modernism, should learn from Christ. (i) There should be confidence in God's abounding resources, which man may claim according to the measure of his faith ; and (ii) there should be confidence also that if only men can be brought to exercise faith, the fulfilment of God's purpose may be much speedier than now appears at all probable, and so the consummation, glorious and blessed, may lie, not in the dim and distant future, but nearer far than those dare to hope who reckon only with men, and leave out God. Faith can hasten, and unbelief can hinder the coming of the Kingdom, which, although in a human process, comes by the power of God's love, truth, and grace.

Contributions and Comments.

Christ's Resurrection as Evidence to Itself.

THE Resurrection of Jesus, as shown to us in the New Testament, whatever may be its ultimate

purpose, is, in the first place, a resurrection to life upon this earth. As such it may be compared or contrasted with other returns, real or supposed, of dead men to the world ; we need not now concern ourselves with ' the resurrection at the last day ' or

any such future resurrection, and men's ideas of what it may be.

We have two kinds of return of the dead to the earth—resurrection, and the appearance of the spirit. Resurrection is a return to the normal conditions of earthly life: it is a return to health when the person has died of disease, as in the cases related both in the Old and New Testaments: in those in the Gospels there is in each case something told which emphasizes the return to normal conditions; the Lord commanded that something should be given to eat to the daughter of Jairus; the young man of Nain sat up and began to speak; Lazarus was to be loosed from his grave-clothes, and on a subsequent occasion sat at meat with others. When Herod supposed that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead, he thought of a normal life, whatever might be the difference between the former and the latter, and though he thought it accounted for the miracles.

The other form of return of the dead, the appearance of the spirit, is temporary, unsubstantial, and only seen by a few persons. Perhaps the best instance is the appearance of Samuel to the Witch of Endor and to Saul; the disciples at Jerusalem, when Jesus appeared to them, 'supposed that they beheld a spirit.' The spirit may be seen and heard; it bears a resemblance which can be recognized to the man in his past life.

But the Resurrection of Jesus is neither a return to the normal conditions of life, nor the appearance of a spirit, yet it has something of the nature of each. It is a new thing. He is the same Person after His Resurrection as before His Death; sooner or later He is always recognized; there are the marks of the nails and of the spear. Yet there is a difference: Mary Magdalene supposed Him to be the gardener (Jn 20¹¹); the two disciples going to Emmaus walk some distance with Him, talk with Him, and sit with Him before they know Him in the breaking of the bread (Lk 24¹³⁻³⁵); the Apostles took Him for a spirit (Lk 24³⁷); the seven disciples at the sea of Tiberias only know Him after the miracle of the draught of fishes (Jn 21¹⁻¹⁴); 'some doubted' when He met them in Galilee (Mt 28¹⁷). There is a difference in His movements (if we may use the word): He appeared among the disciples when the doors were shut (Jn 20^{19, 26}); He vanished out of the sight of the disciples at Emmaus (Lk 24³¹); 'He was parted from them [and was carried up into heaven]' (Lk 24⁵¹); He 'was received up into

heaven' ([Mk] 16¹⁸). All these are plain statements. In addition, the other disciple who came with Peter to the sepulchre when he beheld the linen clothes 'saw and believed' (Jn 20⁸); but this requires some explanatory theory. Here are a number of statements drawn from different Gospels, but all in keeping with one another, describing a kind of resurrection different from anything the writers had ever known before; a resurrection, not the appearance of a spirit (though for a moment mistaken for one), yet bearing some resemblance to such, lasting not for a few moments but for considerable periods, and repeated in various ways several times; He was not unsubstantial, but to be touched and eating with them. We are accustomed to use St. Paul's word and to describe our Lord's body after His Resurrection as a 'spiritual body,' because, while a body, it has some of the characteristics of a spirit. Could the disciples who record such a resurrection have either invented or imagined such a new thing? Invention and imagination alike have to draw on the known; they can combine different aspects of the known, but can scarcely create what is altogether unknown. A resurrection described by different minds with such consistency can only be founded on fact—the fact that it actually took place.

V. T. KIRBY.

St. Peter's Vicarage, Thurgarton.

2 Timothy iv. 13 and The Question of St. Paul's Second Captivity.

THE present trend of scholarship has for some time been against the whole traditional account of St. Paul's last days. No longer are we allowed to believe that he was released, that he made more journeys, revisiting his old friends in Ephesus, Philippi, and other places, and carrying the gospel message even to Spain. The second arrest and the imprisonment in some miserable Roman prison have been taken from us. And all this largely because the evidence for these things came from the Pastorals, and they were not written by St. Paul after all.

But two facts remain which seem to tell in favour of the old view in spite of the difficulties. There is the great weight of tradition, which should count for something, and there are certain passages in the Pastorals themselves. Whatever view may

be taken of those letters as they have come down to us, and of the date of the edition of them that we possess, surely no one can read them without seeing Paul's handwriting here and there all through. And of these authentic passages, 2 Ti 4¹³ is surely the least capable of having been invented. The overcoat, the MSS., the precious parchment rolls of Scriptures or of the Sayings and Doings of the Lord, left behind at Troas in the care of one Carpus : who would have thought of making that up ? So that, if the critics are right about the imprisonment, these things must have been left behind at Troas that night when Eutychus fell asleep during the sermon with such alarming consequences, and Paul had to leave early next day. Then came the voyage to Jerusalem and the momentous events following the entry into the temple and two or three years' captivity at Cæsarea, and the long voyage that ended in shipwreck, and the winter at Malta, and the kindness of the Maltese in supplying the apostle and his friends with what they needed, to take the place of what had gone down with the ship. And then there were the two years in Rome, when Paul had frequent opportunities of seeing his friends, and people came to him from Ephesus and the Lycus valley and Macedonia, and took his letters and messages back with them. And after all this we are asked to believe that Paul suddenly remembered his overcoat and his books that he had left behind five or six years before !

But on the traditional theory, how it all fits in ! He has gone on a journey, leaving some things he was not likely to want just then with a friend in Troas ; and then he is suddenly arrested. In the chill of his Roman prison he begins to long for the overcoat he had left with Carpus a few weeks before, it may be, for winter is coming on, and he has had only too much experience of Roman winters, when he had felt the cold even in the comparative comfort of a hired room. And then there are his papers—letters written to him and copies of his replies, and he might need them for writing some last messages to his converts ; but especially the parchments, with their words of consolation ; no doubt he never travelled without some book or other of the Old Testament in his bag, but these particular rolls that he had not thought he should require on a missionary tour he finds he needs in a Roman prison when under sentence of death.

It is not good scholarship to build on a single text ; but 2 Ti 4¹³, if you look into it, is no bad

foundation for the Second Imprisonment ; it must be from Paul's hand, and so must a good deal more of that chapter, as is plain if it be read with any imagination at all. So there must have been a second captivity ; but if so, may we not continue to believe that the Pastorals were written, at least in outline, by St. Paul himself ?

J. SINCLAIR STEVENSON.

*Irish Mission,
Parantij, India.*

1 Thessalonians i. 3.

'Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in (lit. of) our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father.'

So the A.V. This verse has been a stumbling-block, not to the translators, but to the interpreters. The difficulty lies in the string of genitives with the nouns on which they depend. Dean Alford says of the first pair, 'All sorts of strange meanings have been given to them.' The difficulty is to know whether the genitive in each case is one of origin ('work which faith brings forth'—Alford), or of possession, or of accompaniment. The R.V. follows the A.V. in simply translating the words as they stand. But what do the phrases 'work of faith,' 'labour of love,' and 'patience of hope' mean, and how does the final genitive connect on with the rest ?

W. G. Rutherford (1908) renders : 'your acts of faith, your work of brotherly love, and your unwavering hope in our Lord.' Professor Moffatt has (1916) 'your active faith, and labour of love, and patient hope in our Lord.'

Is not the simplest explanation that the genitives are adjectival genitives, so common in Hebrew and also in the N.T. ? In that case the English would be 'your faithful (or loyal) work, your loving labour, and your hopeful patience.' The dependence of the last genitive, 'of our Lord,' is not so straightforward. It really does not depend upon 'hope' but upon 'patience,' and 'patience' really means 'waiting,' from the Hebrew *qavah*. The last words would therefore be 'the waiting of the hope of the Lord,' which is the Hebrew way of saying 'the hopeful waiting for the Lord.'

T. H. WEIR.

Glasgow College.

2 Kings iv. 26.

A SIDE-LIGHT FROM EAST AFRICA.

SOME readers have probably felt surprise in reading this verse. Although the Shunammite woman has lost her son by death, when Elisha asks her if it is well with her husband and child, she replies, 'Well.' It seems to our Western minds not quite true. The woman goes on afterwards to tell Elisha her trouble without any sort of explanation of her previous apparently contrary statement. The explanation is that she was simply following Eastern custom, and in East Africa to-day we can find almost exact parallels. A Swahili-speaking African even now greets another by saying *Jambo*, which, amongst other things, means 'trouble,' and the greeting is a contraction for 'Have you any trouble?' The answer to the greeting is

Sijambo, which means 'no trouble.' This answer is invariably given as a matter of course and is not intended as a statement of fact, but only as a greeting. After the greeting the person concerned may get to business and tell any amount of troubles. Another question of like nature often asked on meeting a person is *Habari zako*, which means literally 'thy news,' but practically 'What is your news?' Again the answer, whatever the news may be, is an invariable one, namely, *njema*, which means 'good.' This, like the above, is not meant literally, but merely as a greeting, after which the real news may be told. It will be evident how closely this resembles the case of the Shunammite woman. Her first reply (*shalom*) was merely a matter of customary courtesy, and was not intended as a statement of fact.

HENRY HOLLOWAY.

S. Magnus, Lerwick.

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

What it is that saves.

'FORTHWITH, I doubt not, there arises this question in your minds: What place, then, in particular, has the death of Jesus in this whole soul of Him that saves, this whole career of His that restores us to God? It has the central place. It does not stand alone, but it has the central place. All else in His saving life, His saving resurrection, His saving presence with us here to-night, is congregated about His death. It is Jesus Himself who saves, all that He was, and became, and is; but this Jesus that saves comes from the Cross to do it. *It is Jesus that died who saves.* This may seem to contradict what I said a little ago; but it is not so. It was not the death of Jesus that saved Peter; but it was the Jesus, that all the time, even in Galilee, was what His death completed and sealed, who saved Peter. It was not the death of Jesus that saved Stephen; but it was the Jesus that died and still bore the signs of His martyrdom in the invisible realm, who saved Stephen. It is not the death of Jesus, an isolated event in the career of Jesus, that saves you and me. It is the Jesus that died, who saves us.'¹

¹ A. Boyd Scott, *Nevertheless we Believe*, 63.

Spiritualism.

'There are people about us, who, if we may trust their assertions, should be able to help us. They are the people called Spiritualists. They certainly declare to us that they can and do communicate with those who live beyond the veil. Surely this is hopeful! In reality it proves hopeless. So far as we can hear, no priest or prophet among them all has got into touch with the living Christ. They share our disappointment. They try to explain the silence. They affirm that the more developed and purified a spirit is, the farther removed it is from this earthly life and intercourse with this material world. Jesus Christ is too exalted to communicate. Other spirits, in their communications, do sometimes give us news of Him. But, according to these, Christ is removed and remote, as I have described, while others among the spirits declare that they are no nearer Him there than they were on earth. This is, to say the least of it, very disconcerting and disappointing. It is so disconcerting that, even on this point apart from others, I grow more than sceptical of the whole cult of Spiritualism. As a believer in the living Christ, I have a right to demand that they shall put me into communication with Him. For, do

they not tell me that, in the unseen while the lower spirits cannot ascend at will, the higher spirits can descend as they choose? But if that be so, must not even the exalted Christ descend to my longing? In a séance, as my Spiritualist friends assure me, I open a door into the very realm of the blessed departed. If it be so, how dare Christ refuse to descend and reveal Himself to me? If He refuse, as He does, then He is no more the lover of weak and aspiring souls He was in the days of His flesh: can I think this possible? That is the one alternative. The only other alternative is this, that the living Christ in the unseen simply repels and declines the practices of these necromancers. For myself I feel shut up to accept this second alternative. I am impressed with the fact that Christ, who in Galilee dealt gently with superstition, and even responded to the magically minded, who this very night in remote Italian villages responds to the superstitious, will make no response whatever to the people called Spiritualists.’¹

‘Be a Steamer.’

Twenty-four talks to Boy Scouts by Headmasters and men who thoroughly understand boys have been published with the title *How to Make the Most of Life* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net).

One of the talks is by the Rev. E. W. Shephard-Walwyn. It is on ‘The Three Boats.’ ‘Don’t be a barge,’ he says to the Scouts, ‘for it is quite the flattest kind of thing to be—just to let yourself be pulled any way any thing likes to pull you, and to have no power inside that keeps you going in one fixed direction.’

‘And don’t be a sailing vessel, though it is better than a barge, as it can get along without being towed. But it depends upon the wind and currents being favourable.’

What is the Boy Scout to be, then? ‘Be a steamer,’ says Mr. Shephard-Walwyn. ‘That’s the thing! I expect you have been in one, and have seen how the bow slaps the waves on their wet faces, and how the vessel forges along in the teeth of opposing winds and currents. The steamer has a power within.’

‘God can give something to you which will turn you into a steamer, so that you will be able to go along straight on the right way, and not care a little bit what the others do or say to you.’

¹ A. Boyd Scott, *Nevertheless we Believe*, 80.

The Letters of St. Paul.

‘Thus these glowing Epistles become a fitting climax to what has preceded them. As it was the purpose of Paul’s earlier letters to liberalize the Christian faith, and of the second group to spiritualize it, and of the more formal Epistle to the Romans to systematize it, so in the meditations and revelations of Paul’s last phase he is absorbed in the idealizing of history, the lifting of its prose into poetry, the setting of its facts within a cosmic plan. The first intention of Paul was to rescue the new faith from Palestinian asphyxiation and to give it a chance to breathe in the free air of a Greek world; his second aim was the emancipation of that faith from ceremonial and ritual and to secure for it the authority of the spirit; his third desire was to justify that faith by logical reasoning and to rationalize the convictions which he has attained. Finally, he ascends from these plains of debate and demonstration into the serener air of contemplation and vision, as the first disciples went up with their Master on the Mount of Transfiguration, and saw there a glory which was invisible below.’²

St. Paul in Art.

‘It is suggestive to recall the fact that in the comprehensive Calendar of Saints approved by ecclesiastical authorities, from St. Joseph the father of Jesus, to the last subject of canonization, the Apostle Paul has held a very minor place. The most conspicuous convert to the new faith, its hero, preacher and martyr, beyond all comparison the most effective agent in its propagation, Paul is rarely one of the figures which Christian art has loved to commemorate, or before whose shrine the faithful have loved to bend. He is seldom portrayed except as the companion of Peter, and while the chief apostle holds the keys, Paul is to be recognized by the less sacred symbol of the sword. “Is there,” asks Mrs. Jameson, “among the thousand representations of the Apostle Paul, one on which the imagination can rest completely satisfied? I know not one.”’³

NEW POETRY.

N. Marshall Ford.

The Bridge of Flowers, by Mr. N. Marshall Ford (Erskine Macdonald), is a rather irritating book.

² F. G. Peabody, *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World*, 119.

³ *Ibid.* 7.

Many of the poems show very good work, but many are marred—one might almost say ruined—by too great straining of images and of language. We do not refer to the occasional liberties the author takes with English grammar, as in :

He, as of old, still offereth might,
Mountains to move to they who trust,

but to such verses as that which opens the volume :

Earth fell from far,
A bud of sombre flame.
A wandering star
From nests of stars she came.
Shook the great trees
By Life's far river fed ;
Their mystic fruits
And gulfs were peopled.

We do not say that this verse is meaningless, but we do say that it is needlessly obscure, and a succession of such verses becomes tedious. Fortunately not all the poems lie open to this objection, and we quote the two verses of

THE MASTER.

Deep in His eyes
Lay knowledge of the earth and skies
Master of all the mysteries
Of seed and bloom,
Of sun and tide,
Of beauty, wide as earth is wide.
He veiled—to teach us sacrifice.

Who fathoms evil? Who can say
That Nature loves to rend and slay.
Fights she the forces day by day
Which ambush
This dim way of ours?
Sees she, when serpents crouch in flowers
Lion and lamb together play.

Bessie W. Rumsby.

Though there are here and there hints of drab city streets with their hustle and noisy traffic in the little collection of poems by Bessie W. Rumsby, *In the Street* (Edgar & Skinner; 1s. 6d. net), much more in evidence are the fragrant scent of gardens and of country lanes and meadows, the glint of daffodils on mossy banks, and the perfume of violets and of wallflower.

Mrs. Rumsby is the wife of the Rev. F. W. Rumsby, Minister of Kent Street Baptist Church, Portsea, Portsmouth, who in a foreword explains that the poems are reprinted from their Church Magazine and other periodicals in response to urgent requests from all quarters to do so.

'HE GIVETH UNTO HIS BELOVED IN THEIR SLEEP.'
—Ps. cxxvii. 2 (R.V.).

I dreamed of roses all the night,
Then waking, faced the toilsome day—
But oh, the perfume of my dream
Trailed with me all along the way!
E'en so He gives us in our sleep
Not only rest, but visions bright;
And wond'rous melodies He weaves
Amid the silences of night!
And best of all He takes us back
To childhood's haunts, and lets us stray
Thro' early Beulah-lands, and view
The Heaven that is not far away!
The doubter looks again to God—
The wavering readjustment find;
Because in dreams we live again
The child-white days we left behind!
These 'treasures of the darkness' span
The present with its want and fear,
And hold us to our earliest faith,
That God, and Heaven, are always near!

Hope Fairfax Taylor.

Hope Fairfax Taylor is the author of *Songs for Disciples* (Blackwell; 2s. net). The poems, which are not all religious (as the title might suggest), are simple lyrical pieces for the main part. At times the verse becomes rather prosy—witness the following passage taken almost at random from 'Our Village':

Is it only a vision the poet
Never may live to see
Fulfilled? A dream in the heart of God
Unwrought in reality?

We quote one of a series of three sonnets, 'In Memory E. F. T.', entitled

NEW FOUND.

Beloved, when thou wentest first, alone,
Whither I might not follow as I knew,
Over the high pass, where the stars are few
And stones are many and the road unknown,
I could not pray—thou seemed'st no more mine own
But God's. I could not sing—no sweet accord
In answer sang, no more might share the stored
Delight of life—thou hadst my thoughts outgrown.
But now I commune with thee in the courts
Of song and silence 'neath the open sky;
We meet in happier mansions and my thoughts
Wing with thine own and purer heights descry;
My narrow prayer unfolds to greet the Sun,
I see the splendour of the Three in One.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.